arXiv:1511.09194v1 [math.DS] 30 Nov 2015

WANDERING INTERVALS IN SELF-SIMILAR INTERVAL EXCHANGE MAPS: THE CUBIC ARNOUX-YOCCOZ EXAMPLE

MILTON COBO, RODOLFO GUTIÉRREZ-ROMO, AND ALEJANDRO MAASS

Abstract. In this article we provide sufficient conditions on a self-similar interval exchange map, whose renormalization matrix has complex eigenvalues of modulus greater than one, for the existence of affine interval exchange maps with wandering intervals and semi-conjugate with it. These conditions are based on the algebraic properties of the complex eigenvalues and the complex fractals built from the natural substitution emerging from self-similarity. We show that the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz interval exchange map satisfies these conditions.

1. Introduction

The existence of wandering intervals in dynamical systems has been studied for a long time. Denjoy [Den32] proved that an orientation-preserving $\mathscr{C}^1$-diffeomorphism of the circle with irrational rotation number is conjugate with an irrational rotation if and only if it has no wandering intervals, and constructed examples of $\mathscr{C}^r$-diffeomorphisms of this type with wandering intervals for $r < 2$. The absence of wandering intervals is ensured for $\mathscr{C}^2$-diffeomorphisms.

By suspending a rotation, one obtains a linear flow on a two-dimensional torus. A natural generalization of these flows are linear flows on surfaces of a higher genus, which when restricted to a Poincaré section induce interval exchange maps. In this sense, interval exchange maps are natural generalizations of rotations of the circle.

A bijective map $T\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ is said to be an *interval exchange map* (i.e.m.) if there exists a finite partition $(I_a; a \in \mathscr{A})$ of $[0,1)$ made of intervals such that $T(t) = t + \delta_a$ for each $t \in I_a$ and $a \in \mathscr{A}$. Clearly T is a piecewise isometry of the unit interval exchanging the intervals $(I_a; a \in \mathscr{A})$. An i.e.m. T is said to be *self-similar* if there exists $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that the map $T^{(1)}\colon [0,\alpha) \to [0,\alpha)$ of first return by T to the interval $[0,\alpha)$ is up to rescaling equal to T. The natural symbolic extension of a self-similar i.e.m. is generated by a substitution. An *affine* interval exchange map (affine i.e.m.) $f\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ is a bijective piecewise affine map with positive slopes. The vector $(\ell_a; a \in \mathscr{A})$, where ℓ_a is the slope of f in the a-th interval of continuity, is called *the slope vector* of f.

Levitt [Lev87] constructed an example of a non-uniquely ergodic affine i.e.m. with wandering intervals, showing that there exist Denjoy counterexamples of arbitrary smoothness in some surfaces of genus $g \geq 2$. Given a slope vector and a self-similar i.e.m., Camelier and Gutiérrez [CG97] provided necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of an affine i.e.m. with the same number of intervals and such slope vector which is semi-conjugate with the self-similar i.e.m. Namely, such map exists if and only if the logarithm of the given slope vector, $\log \ell = (\log \ell_a; a \in \mathscr{A})$, is orthogonal to the vector of interval lengths $\lambda = (|I_a|; a \in \mathscr{A})$. The self-similarity

of the i.e.m. implies that $R\lambda = \alpha^{-1}\lambda$, where R is the renormalization matrix (recall that $[0, \alpha)$ is the interval of renormalization) and $\alpha^{-1} > 1$ is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of R. Thus, basic linear algebra implies that $\log \ell$ is orthogonal to λ if and only if $\log \ell$ belongs to the invariant subspace corresponding to all the eigenvalues of $M = R^t$ different from α^{-1}. We remark that M is the matrix associated with the substitution associated with the self-similar i.e.m.

If $\log \ell$ belongs to the stable space of M, Camelier and Gutiérrez proved that any semi-conjugate affine i.e.m. with this slope vector is in fact conjugate with an i.e.m. (i.e. has no wandering intervals). The resulting conjugacy is of class $\mathcal{C}^{1+\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon > 0$ depending on the particular eigenspace [Bar99]. They also built an example of a uniquely ergodic affine i.e.m. with wandering intervals that is strictly semi-conjugate with a self-similar i.e.m. This last example and extensions of the results in [CG97] were considered more deeply by Cobo in [Cob02], where a generalization is also obtained by introducing the Rauzy-Zorich Oseledets decomposition. In the case that $\log \ell$ belongs to the unstable space of M, Bressaud, Hubert and Maass proved in [BHM10] that if it also lies in the eigenspace associated with a real eigenvalue of modulus strictly greater than one, which is different from the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue α^{-1} but Galois-conjugate with it, then one can choose a semi-conjugate affine i.e.m. with such slope vector and wandering intervals. When the given vector of logarithms lies in a neutral eigenspace of M, Bressaud, Bufetov and Hubert in [BBH14] proved that any semi-conjugate affine i.e.m. with such slope vector has no wandering intervals. Finally, in [MMY10], Marmi, Moussa and Yoccoz proved that the existence of affine i.e.m. with wandering intervals semi-conjugate with a given i.e.m. is generic. Thus many non self-similar examples arise.

In this article we study the remaining case of the program stated in [CG97]. That is, we consider a self-similar i.e.m. and a slope vector ℓ whose logarithm $\log \ell$ lies in an eigenspace of M corresponding to a non real eigenvalue of modulus strictly larger than one. We will heavily rely on the strategy of [BHM10] and the geometrical models for substitutions defined by Arnoux, Bernat and Bressaud in [ABB11]. These geometrical models are often of fractal nature. We will see that some properties of these fractals are sufficient conditions for the existence of an affine i.e.m. with wandering intervals that is semi-conjugate with a given self-similar i.e.m. having the aforementioned properties. Specifically, we will prove the following theorem:

Theorem A. *Let T be a self-similar i.e.m. Assume that M has a non real eigenvalue β with $|\beta| > 1$ and which is Galois-conjugate with α. If T has the weak unique representation property for β, then, for almost all complex eigenvector γ associated with β, the vector $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma)$ can be realized as the logarithm of the slope vector of an affine i.e.m. which is semi-conjugate with T and has wandering intervals.*

The weak unique representation property, which will be stated in Section 6, is related to the different ways that the extreme points of the dual Rauzy fractal, in the sense of [ABB11], can be written as certain sums $\sum_{m\geq 1} z_m \beta^{-m}$ with coefficients z_m belonging to a finite subset of the field $\mathbb{Q}[\beta]$. In a work-in-progress we have made some interesting progress in understanding whether a self-similar i.e.m. satisfies the weak unique representation property.

Finally, we apply the techniques developed along this work to the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m. [AY81]. When defined on the circle, this map is self-similar and its

renormalization matrix has an eigenvalue β with $|\beta| > 1$ and which is Galois-conjugate with α. We will discuss this example in Section 8 and prove that:

Theorem B. *There exists an affine i.e.m. with wandering intervals which is semi-conjugate with the Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m.*

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we outline the general strategy introduced in [CG97] that will be used to prove the main theorem. In Section 3 we present some basic properties and definitions concerning self-similar i.e.m.'s. In Section 4 the notion of minimal sequence is presented. In Section 5 the fractals associated with β and the concept of extreme points are defined. In Section 6 the unique representation property is introduced. In Section 7 we restate and prove the main theorem. In Section 8 we prove that the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m. satisfies the weak unique representation property and thus that the main theorem can be applied to it.

2. Strategy

Let $T\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ be a self-similar i.e.m. with continuity intervals $(I_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$. Our goal is to prove that under the hypotheses of Theorem A there exists an affine i.e.m. $f\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ with wandering intervals that is semi-conjugate with T or, equivalently, is a topological extension of T.
In order to achieve this we will follow the strategy devised by Camelier and Gutiérrez in [CG97] and used by Cobo in [Cob02] and by Bressaud, Hubert and Maass in [BHM10]. That is, we search for a Borel probability measure with atoms μ on $[0,1)$ that assigns positive measure to every open interval with the following property: for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a positive real ℓ_a such that

$$\mu(T(J)) = \ell_a \mu(J), \tag{1}$$

for every Borel set $J \subseteq I_a$. By following the proof of [CG97, Lemma 3.6] and using such measure, one constructs an affine i.e.m. that is semi-conjugate with T having a wandering interval. We skip the details to avoid introducing unnecessary notation.
One way to construct such a measure is finding a sequence $\omega \in \Omega_T$, where Ω_T is the natural symbolic extension of T constructed from codings of itineraries of points by T with respect to the continuity intervals $(I_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$, a complex vector $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{A}}$ and a number $\rho > 0$ such that:

$$\liminf_{n \to \pm\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega))}{|n|^\rho} > 0, \tag{2}$$

where $\gamma_n(\omega) = \gamma_{\omega_0} + \cdots + \gamma_{\omega_{n-1}}$ and $\gamma_{-n}(\omega) = -(\gamma_{\omega_{-n}} + \cdots + \gamma_{\omega_{-1}})$ for $n \geq 1$. This implies that $K = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \exp(-\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega))) < \infty$. Thus, if $\omega \in \Omega_T$ is the coding by T of $t \in [0,1)$, then the measure $\mu = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \exp(-\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega)))\mathbf{1}_{T^n(t)}$ satisfies the desired properties for the slope vector $\ell = (\exp(-\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_a)); a \in \mathcal{A})$.
Otherwise, if ω is not the coding by T of any point in $[0,1)$, then it is the coding by $T'\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ of some point in $[0,1)$, where T' is equal to T up to some discontinuity points. The strategy can be still applied to find $f'\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ and $h\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ such that $h \circ f' = T' \circ h$, where h is continuous, surjective, nondecreasing and noninjective. Let f be the right-continuous function that is equal to f' up to a finite number of points. Then f is an affine i.e.m. By right-continuity, $h \circ f = T \circ h$. Moreover, f has wandering intervals since $h(J)$ is a point for some interval $J \subseteq [0,1)$. Therefore, it is enough to prove (2) for a sequence ω in Ω_T.

3. Background and Preliminaries

3.1. **Interval exchange maps and affine interval exchange maps.** A bijective map $T\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ is said to be an *interval exchange map* (i.e.m.) if there exists a finite partition $(I_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ of $[0,1)$ made of intervals such that $T(t) = t + \delta_a$ for each $t \in I_a$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Clearly T is a piecewise isometry of the unit interval exchanging the intervals $(I_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$. The vector $\delta = (\delta_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ is called the *translation vector* of T.
An i.e.m. T is determined by the following combinatorial data: a *length vector* $\lambda = (\lambda_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ of positive entries corresponding to the length of each interval I_a and a pair of bijections $\pi_0, \pi_1\colon \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|\} \to \mathcal{A}$ encoding the order of the intervals $(I_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ before and after the transformation.
An i.e.m. T is said to be *self-similar* if there exists $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that the map $T^{(1)}\colon [0,\alpha) \to [0,\alpha)$ of first return by T to the interval $[0,\alpha)$ is up to rescaling equal to T. These maps are called *renormalizable* in [CG97]. In [LPV07] they are called *scale-invariant* and the term self-similar is used for maps such that the induced map on some interval is, up to rescaling and rotation, the same map T. Here, for convenience, we keep the notation used in [CG97] and used implicitly in [BHM10].
For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we define the interval $I_a^{(1)} = \alpha I_a$ and denote by R the *renormalization matrix* given by $R_{a,b} = |\{0 \le k \le r_b - 1; T^k(I_b^{(1)}) \subseteq I_a\}|$, where r_b is the first return time of $I_b^{(1)}$ to $[0,\alpha)$.
Self-similar i.e.m.'s are always uniquely ergodic and therefore minimal (see [Vee78]). Recall that T is minimal if any point in $[0,1)$ has a dense orbit. For more details on minimal i.e.m.'s see [Kea75; Via06].
An *affine interval exchange map* (affine i.e.m.) $f\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ is a bijective, piecewise affine map with positive slopes. If $(J_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ are the continuity intervals of f we say that $\ell = (\ell_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ is its *slope vector*, where $\ell_a > 0$ is the slope of f restricted to J_a: $f(x) = \ell_a x + t_a$ for every $x \in J_a$ and for some translation vector $t = (t_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$. Clearly, an i.e.m. is an affine i.e.m. with slope vector $\ell = (1, \dots, 1)$.
We are interested in affine i.e.m. extensions of an i.e.m. T with wandering intervals. That is, an affine i.e.m. f with wandering intervals such that there exists a continuous, surjective, nondecreasing and noninjective map $h\colon [0,1) \to [0,1)$ satisfying $h \circ f = T \circ h$. As mentioned in the introduction the existence of such extensions was already studied in [CG97; Cob02; BHM10; BBH14; MMY10].

3.2. **Substitution subshifts and prefix-suffix decomposition.** We refer to [Que87] and [Fog02] and references therein for the general theory of substitutions.
Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite set or *alphabet*. A *word* is a finite string of symbols in $\mathcal{A}$, namely $w = w_0 \dots w_{m-1}$, where $|w| = m$ is called the *length* of w. The *empty word* ε is defined as the word of length zero. The set of all words in $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^*$ and the set of words of positive length is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^+ = \mathcal{A}^* \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$.
We will need to consider words indexed by integers. We will write such a word as $w = w_{-m} \dots w_{-1} \cdot w_0 \dots w_n$, where m, n are nonnegative integers and the dot separates negative and nonnegative coordinates. The set of one-sided infinite sequences $\omega = (\omega_m)_{m \ge 0}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Analogously, $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the set of two-sided infinite sequences $\omega = (\omega_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$.
A *substitution* is a map $\sigma\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}^+$. It naturally extends to $\mathcal{A}^+$, $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ by concatenation. For $\omega = (\omega_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the extension is given by

$$\sigma(\omega) = \dots \sigma(\omega_{-2})\sigma(\omega_{-1}) \cdot \sigma(\omega_0)\sigma(\omega_1) \dots,$$

where the central dot separates the negative and nonnegative coordinates of $\sigma(\omega)$. A further natural convention is that $\sigma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$.
Let M^σ be the matrix with indexes in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $M^\sigma_{a,b}$ is the number of times the letter b appears in $\sigma(a)$ for any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. The substitution is said to be *primitive* if there exists an integer $n \geq 1$ such that, for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $\sigma^n(a)$ contains every letter of $\mathcal{A}$, where σ^n denotes n consecutive iterations of σ.
Let $\Omega_\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the subshift defined from σ. That is, $\omega \in \Omega_\sigma$ if and only if any subword of ω is a subword of $\sigma^n(a)$ for some integer $n \geq 0$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We call Ω_σ the *substitution subshift* associated with σ. This subshift is minimal whenever σ is primitive.
Assume σ is primitive. By the recognizability property (see [Mos92]), given a point $\omega \in \Omega_\sigma$ there exists a unique sequence $(p_m, c_m, s_m)_{m\geq 0} \in (\mathcal{A}^* \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}^*)^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that for each integer $m \geq 0$ we have $\sigma(c_{m+1}) = p_m c_m s_m$ and

$$\ldots \sigma^3(p_3)\sigma^2(p_2)\sigma^1(p_1)p_0 \cdot c_0 s_0 \sigma^1(s_1)\sigma^2(s_2)\sigma^3(s_3)\ldots$$

is the central part of ω, where the dot separates negative and nonnegative coordinates. We remark that the p_m's (resp. s_m's) are in the finite subset of $\mathcal{A}^*$ containing all prefixes (resp. suffixes) of $\sigma(a)$ for all a in $\mathcal{A}$. This sequence is called the *prefix-suffix decomposition* of ω or the p.s.d. of ω (for more details see for instance [CS01]).
If only finitely many suffixes s_m's are nonempty, then there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and nonnegative integers n and q such that

$$\omega_{[0,\infty)} = c_0 s_0 \sigma^1(s_1)\ldots\sigma^n(s_n) \lim_{m\to\infty} \sigma^{mq}(a).$$

Analogously, if only finitely many p_m's are nonempty, then there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and nonnegative integers n and q such that

$$\omega_{(-\infty,-1]} = \lim_{m\to\infty} \sigma^{mq}(a)\sigma^n(p_n)\ldots\sigma^1(p_1)p_0.$$

The recognizability property also implies that $\Omega_\sigma = \bigcup_{m=0}^{n} S^{-m}(\sigma(\Omega_\sigma))$ for some positive integer n, where $S\colon \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the left shift map.

3.3. **Symbolic coding of self-similar i.e.m.'s.** Let T be a self-similar i.e.m. and $(I_a; a \in \mathcal{A})$ its associated intervals. Recall that under the self-similar condition T is minimal. Given $t \in [0, 1)$ we construct a symbolic sequence $\omega = (\omega_m)_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, where $\omega_m = a$ if and only if $T^m(t) \in I_a$. The sequence ω is called the *itinerary* of t. Let $\Omega_T \subseteq A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the closure of the set of sequences constructed in this way for every $t \in [0, 1)$. Clearly the sequence associated with $T(t)$ corresponds to $S(\omega)$, where $S\colon \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the left shift map. Moreover, it is classical that there exists a continuous and surjective map $\pi_T\colon \Omega_T \to [0, 1)$ such that $T \circ \pi_T = \pi_T \circ S$. The map π_T is invertible up to a countable set of points corresponding to the orbits of discontinuities of T. Since T is self-similar, the restriction of S to Ω_T is minimal and Ω_T is a substitutive subshift associated with a substitution $\sigma\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}^+$. That is, $\Omega_T = \Omega_\sigma$ for some substitution σ. The substitution is constructed in the following way: $\sigma(a) = w_0 \ldots w_{r_a-1}$ if and only if $T^m(I_a^{(1)}) \subseteq I_{w_m}$ for all $0 \leq m \leq r_a - 1$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We then have that $M^\sigma = R^t$, the transpose of the renormalization matrix associated with T. For details see [CG97].

3.4. **Basic facts about self-similar i.e.m.'s.** Let T be a self-similar i.e.m. which is self-induced on the interval $[0, \alpha)$ and let R be its renormalization matrix. The minimality of T implies that a power of R is positive and that $\alpha^{-1} > 1$ is its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue. The vector of lengths λ is an eigenvector of R associated with the eigenvalue α^{-1} and the translation vector δ is an eigenvector of $M = R^t$ associated with α. Moreover, $\delta, \lambda \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)^{\mathcal{A}}$. For details see [LPV08, Theorem 6].
If β is an eigenvalue of M which is Galois-conjugate with α and $\psi\colon \mathbb{Q}[\alpha] \mapsto \mathbb{Q}[\beta]$ is the natural field isomorphism, then ψ can be extended to a vector space isomorphism $\psi\colon \mathbb{Q}[\alpha]^{\mathcal{A}} \mapsto \mathbb{Q}[\beta]^{\mathcal{A}}$. It is easy to see that:

Lemma 3.1. *$\Gamma = \psi(\delta)$ is an eigenvector of M associated with β.*

Another important property of the matrix M is the following:

Lemma 3.2. *If β is an eigenvalue of M which is Galois-conjugate with α, then β has algebraic and geometric multiplicity one.*

Proof. If $p(t)$ is a polynomial, then its reciprocal polynomial $\tilde{p}(t)$ is defined as $\tilde{p}(t) = t^{\deg p} p(1/t)$. One says that $p(t)$ is self-reciprocal if $\tilde{p}(t) = p(t)$. As proved in [LPV08, Section 3.2] the characteristic polynomial $p(t)$ of M may factor in only two possible ways. Either $p(t)$ is self-reciprocal and irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ or it factors as $p(t) = p_1(t)\tilde{p}_1(t)q(t)$, where $p_1(t)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ and α and β are roots of $p_1(t)$. It is well-known that the eigenspaces of matrices with irreducible characteristic polynomials must have dimension one. Therefore, in either case the algebraic and geometric multiplicity of β is one. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let β be a non real eigenvalue of M which is Galois-conjugate with α. Then β^n is never a real number for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\beta^n = \bar{\beta}^n \in \mathbb{R}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We may assume that $n \geq 2$. Since $(t - \beta)(t - \bar{\beta})$ is a factor of the characteristic polynomial of M, then $(t - \beta^n)(t - \bar{\beta}^n)$ is a factor of the characteristic polynomial of M^n. Therefore, M^n has a real eigenvalue $\beta^n = \bar{\beta}^n$ which is Galois-conjugate with α^n and has algebraic multiplicity 2. Arguing as in the last lemma for M^n, we get that β^n is a simple eigenvalue, which is a contradiction. □

4. Minimal sequences associated with a self-similar i.e.m.

We fix a self-similar interval exchange map T which is self-induced on the interval $[0, \alpha)$ with $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let $M = R^t$ be the matrix of its associated substitution σ and $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ be a non real eigenvalue of M which is Galois-conjugate with α. By Corollary 3.3, it has an irrational angle. We will assume that $|\beta| > 1$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists a "canonical" eigenvector $\Gamma = \psi(\delta)$ associated with β and by Lemma 3.2 its associated eigenspace has dimension one.

Definition 4.1. *For a given word $w = w_0 \dots w_{n-1} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and an eigenvector γ associated with β we denote by $\gamma(w) = \gamma_{w_0} + \cdots + \gamma_{w_{n-1}}$.*

It is easy to see that for any integer $n \geq 0$,

$$\gamma(\sigma^n(w)) = \beta^n \gamma(w). \tag{3}$$

The following lemma will not be used later, but we state it for completeness.

Lemma 4.2. *Let γ be an eigenvector of M associated with β. Then $\gamma(w) \neq 0$ for any itinerary $w = w_0 \dots w_{n-1} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ by T. In particular, $\gamma_a \neq 0$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. From Lemma 3.2 the eigenspace associated with β is simple. Then it is enough to prove the lemma for $\Gamma = \psi(\delta)$.
If w is an itinerary by T of length n, then there exists $t \in [0,1)$ such that w is the first n letters of the itinerary of t with respect to the partition $(I_a; a \in A)$. It is not hard to see that $T^n(x) = x + \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \delta_{w_m}$. Since T is minimal, $T^n(x) \neq x$ and thus $\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \delta_{w_m} \neq 0$. Therefore, from the definition of Γ and ψ we get that $\Gamma(w) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \Gamma_{w_m} = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \psi(\delta_{w_m}) = \psi(\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \delta_{w_m}) \neq 0$. □

Definition 4.3. *Let γ be an eigenvector of M associated with β and $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ be an itinerary by T. A prefix w' of w is said to be a* minimal prefix *for w and γ if*

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(w')) = \min\{\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(w'')); w'' \text{ is a prefix of } w\}.$$

For a sequence $\omega = (\omega_m)_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega_T$ we define $\gamma_0(\omega) = 0$, $\gamma_n(\omega) = \gamma(\omega_0 \dots \omega_{n-1})$ for $n \geq 1$ and $\gamma_n(\omega) = -\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_{-1})$ for $n \leq -1$.

Definition 4.4. *A sequence $\omega \in \Omega_T$ is a* minimal sequence *for the vector γ if*

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega)) \geq 0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Our purpose is to prove that minimal sequences for some eigenvector γ satisfy equation (2). This does not necessarily hold for an arbitrary eigenvector γ.
The next lemma illustrates last definition in another useful way for finite words.

Lemma 4.5. *Let γ be an eigenvector of M associated with β and let $\omega \in \Omega_T$ be a minimal sequence for γ. Then, for all integers $n \leq -1$ and $m \geq n$ we have that*

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_{-1})) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_m)).$$

Proof. If $m \leq -1$, then

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_{-1})) - \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_m)) = -\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)) \leq 0$$

by minimality of ω. If $m \geq 0$, then

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_m)) - \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_n \dots \omega_{-1})) = \mathrm{Re}(\gamma_m(\omega)) \geq 0$$

by minimality of ω. □

Lemma 4.6. *There exist minimal sequences for any eigenvector γ of M associated with β.*

Proof. First notice that $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma) \neq 0$, because $\beta \notin \mathbb{R}$. Recall that $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma)$ is orthogonal to λ. Then, there exist letters $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_a) < 0$ and $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_b) > 0$. By minimality of T there exists an itinerary of the form awb with $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$.
Let $\beta_0 = \beta/|\beta|$ and consider $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ a sequence of integers such that $\beta_0^{n_k} \to 1$ when $k \to \infty$, which is possible since β_0 is not a root of unity. In this way there is a decomposition

$$\sigma^{n_k}(awb) = \sigma^{n_k}(a)\sigma^{n_k}(w)\sigma^{n_k}(b) = \omega_{-m_k}\omega_{-m_k+1} \dots \omega_{-1} \cdot \omega_0\omega_1 \dots \omega_{m'_k},$$

with the dot marking the minimal sum with respect to γ, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_{-m_k} \dots \omega_{-1})) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_{-m_k} \dots \omega_m))$$

for every $-m_k \leq m \leq m'_k$. We claim that both sequences $(m_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and $(m'_k)_{k\geq 0}$ go to infinity when $k \to \infty$. For this we only need to prove that both sequences $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_{-m_k} \dots \omega_{-1}))$ and $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_0 \dots \omega_{m'_k}))$ are unbounded. First recall that, from

(3), $\gamma(\sigma^{n_k}(a)) = \beta^{n_k}\gamma_a = |\beta|^{n_k}\beta_0^{n_k}\gamma_a$ and $\gamma(\sigma^{n_k}(b)) = |\beta|^{n_k}\beta_0^{n_k}\gamma_b$. Since $\beta_0^{n_k}$ is close to one for all large enough k, then from the choice of a and b we get

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\sigma^{n_k}(a))) \to -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\sigma^{n_k}(b))) \to \infty.$$

But from the definition of the decomposition we have that

$$\mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\sigma^{n_k}(a))) \geq \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_{m_k}\dots\omega_{-1})) \text{ and } \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\sigma^{n_k}(b))) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\gamma(\omega_0\dots\omega_{m'_k})).$$

Thus the claim follows.
By taking a subsequence one can assume that $\omega_{-m_k}\omega_{-m_k+1}\dots\omega_{-1}\cdot\omega_0\omega_1\dots\omega_{m'_k}$ converges to a sequence $\omega \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Since awb is a subword of a point in Ω_T and $\sigma(\Omega_T) \subseteq \Omega_T$, we obtain that $\omega \in \Omega_T$. Moreover, by construction we have that $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega)) \geq 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, which proves that $\omega \in \Omega_T$ is a minimal sequence for γ. □

5. Fractals associated with a self-similar i.e.m.

We continue with notations of previous section. So $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ is a non real eigenvalue of M which is Galois-conjugate with α and $\beta_0 = \beta/|\beta|$ has an irrational angle (see Corollary 3.3). Along this section γ is a fixed eigenvector of M associated with β. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$ set

$$\mathcal{S}_a = \{(p_m, c_m, s_m)_{m\geq 1}; \sigma(a) = p_1c_1s_1 \text{ and } \sigma(c_m) = p_{m+1}c_{m+1}s_{m+1} \text{ for all } m \geq 1\}.$$

For $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ write $x = (p_m^x, c_m^x, s_m^x)_{m\geq 1}$ and define functions $\varkappa_a, \varkappa_a^{(n)} \colon \mathcal{S}_a \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and integer $n \geq 1$ by

$$\varkappa_a(x) = \sum_{m\geq 1} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x) \text{ and } \varkappa_a^{(n)}(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x).$$

Clearly, the previous functions and several notations below depend on γ. To simplify we will not include γ in the notations unless it becomes necessary. We will indicate explicitly if we need to indicate γ .

Definition 5.1. *The* fractal associated with $a \in \mathcal{A}$ *is the set* $\mathfrak{F}_a = \{\varkappa_a(x); x \in \mathcal{S}_a\}$. *We also define* $\mathfrak{F}_a^{(n)} = \{\varkappa_a^{(n)}(x); x \in \mathcal{S}_a\}$. *We say that* $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ *is a* representation of $z \in \mathfrak{F}_a$ *if* $z = \varkappa_a(x)$.

Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$. From the definition of $\mathcal{S}_a$ it is easy to see that for any $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ we have that $\sigma^n(a) = \sigma^{n-1}(p_1^x)\dots p_n^x c_n^x s_n^x \dots \sigma^{n-1}(s_1^x)$ for any integer $n \geq 1$. Furthermore, we have that $\mathfrak{F}_a = \bigcup_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{F}_a^{(n)}$. Indeed, let $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ and $n \geq 1$. We can "truncate" x in the following way: let $x|_n$ be the sequence defined by $(p_m^{x|_n}, c_m^{x|_n}, s_m^{x|_n}) = (p_m^x, c_m^x, s_m^x)$ for every $1 \leq m \leq n$. For each $m \geq n+1$ we proceed inductively by defining $(p_m^{x|_n}, c_m^{x|_n}, s_m^{x|_n}) = (\varepsilon, c_m^{x|_n}, s_m^{x|_n})$ in a way such that $\sigma(c_m^{x|_n}) = c_{m+1}^{x|_n}s_{m+1}^{x|_n}$. It is easy to see that $x|_n \in \mathcal{S}_a$ and that $\varkappa_a(x|_n) = \varkappa_a^{(n)}(x)$, so $\mathfrak{F}_a^{(n)} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_a$ and the claim follows. In a similar way, we can construct a point $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ such that $p_m^x = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 1$. Clearly, $\varkappa_a(x) = 0$, so $0 \in \mathfrak{F}_a$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{F}_a \neq \{0\}$. In fact, by primitivity of σ and the fact that $\gamma \neq 0$ it is easy to see that, for some integer $n \geq 1$, there exists a prefix w of $\sigma^n(a)$ that satisfies $\gamma(w) \neq 0$. We can then choose $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ such that



FIGURE 1. The dot indicates an extreme point of one Arnoux-Yoccoz fractal in the direction of the line.

$w = \sigma^{n-1}(p_1^x)\dots p_n^x$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa_a^{(n)}(x) &= \sum_{m=1}^{n} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x) = \frac{1}{\beta^n}\sum_{m=1}^{n}\beta^{n-m}\gamma(p_m^x) = \frac{1}{\beta^n}\sum_{m=1}^{n}\gamma(\sigma^{n-m}(p_m^x)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta^n}\gamma(\sigma^{n-1}(p_1^x)\dots p_{n-1}^x) = \frac{1}{\beta^n}\gamma(w) \neq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Finally, consider $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ such that $s_m^x = \varepsilon$ for each integer $m \geq 1$, which can be defined inductively as before. We obtain that $\sigma^n(a) = \sigma^{n-1}(p_1^x)\dots p_n^x c_n^x$ for each integer $n \geq 1$, so a similar computation as (4) shows that $\varkappa_a(x) = \gamma_a \in \mathfrak{F}_a$.
An elementary computation yields that $\mathfrak{F}_a$ is a particular case of a fractal built by projecting stepped lines to an expanding plane as defined in [ABB11] and it is not necessarily a Rauzy fractal [CS01]. Thus, the fractal $\mathfrak{F}_a$ is a compact and path-connected subset of the plane. In addition, in [ABB11] the authors study the fractals associated with the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m., proving that they have nonempty interior and that they are somehow related to the so-called tribonnacci fractal. In Section 8 we will find a parametrization of the boundary of the fractal associated with the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz example. This map will serve as an example to illustrate our main result and the techniques developed along the article. Although this i.e.m. is not self-similar in the sense we are following here (see Section 3), Theorem A can be still applied by making some slight modifications.

We are interested in the extreme points of the defined fractals along directions.

Definition 5.2. *For $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and an integer $n \geq 1$ define*

$$v_a(\tau) = \min_{z\in\mathfrak{F}_a} \mathrm{Re}(\tau z) \text{ and } v_a^{(n)}(\tau) = \min_{z\in\mathfrak{F}_a^{(n)}} \mathrm{Re}(\tau z).$$

We call $E_a(\tau) = \{z \in \mathfrak{F}_a; \mathrm{Re}(\tau z) = v_a(\tau)\}$ the set of extreme points *of $\mathfrak{F}_a$ for the direction τ as shown by Figure 1. Clearly $v_a(\tau) \leq v_a^{(n)}(\tau) \leq 0$ since $\mathfrak{F}_a^{(n)} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_a$ and $0 \in \mathfrak{F}_a^{(n)}$.*

Lemma 5.3. *The function $v_a\colon \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Let $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{S}^1$ that converges to $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Assume first by contradiction that $u = \liminf_{n\to\infty} v_a(\tau_n) < v_a(\tau)$. Let $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be a sequence such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} v_a(\tau_{n_k}) = u$. Let $z_{n_k} \in \mathfrak{F}_a$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\tau_{n_k} z_{n_k}) = v_a(\tau_{n_k})$. Since $\mathfrak{F}_a$ is compact, we can assume that $\lim_{k\to\infty} z_{n_k} = z \in \mathfrak{F}_a$. We have that

$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{Re}(\tau_{n_k} z_{n_k}) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau z)$, so $\mathrm{Re}(\tau z) = u < v_a(\tau)$, a contradiction. Now, let $z \in \mathfrak{F}_a$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\tau z) = v_a(\tau)$. Clearly $v_a(\tau_n) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\tau_n z)$ and therefore $\limsup_{n\to\infty} v_a(\tau_n) \leq v_a(\tau)$. We obtain that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} v_a(\tau_n) \leq v_a(\tau) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} v_a(\tau_n),$$

which shows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} v_a(\tau_n) = v_a(\tau)$. □

5.1. **Basic properties of extreme points.** We will now present some important properties of extreme points that will be used to prove the main theorem.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Let w be a minimal prefix for $\sigma^n(a)$ and the vector $\tau\gamma$. Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ be any sequence that satisfies $w = \sigma^{n-1}(p_1^x)\dots p_n^x$. Then $v_a^{(n)}(\beta_0^n \tau) = \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^n \tau \varkappa_a(x))$.*

Proof. Take $y = (q_m, b_m, r_m)_{m\geq 1} \in \mathcal{S}_a$ and let $w' = \sigma^{n-1}(q_1)\dots\sigma(q_{n-1})q_n$. By hypotesis, $\mathrm{Re}(\tau\gamma(w)) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\tau\gamma(w'))$. By using (3) we obtain that

$$\gamma(w) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \beta^{n-m}\gamma(p_m^x) = \beta^n \sum_{m=1}^{n} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x) = \beta^n \varkappa_a^{(n)}(x).$$

Therefore, multiplying by τ, taking real part and multiplying by $|\beta|^{-n}$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^n \tau \varkappa_a^{(n)}(x)) &= |\beta|^{-n}\,\mathrm{Re}(\tau\gamma(w)) \\ &\leq |\beta|^{-n}\,\mathrm{Re}(\tau\gamma(w')) = \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^n \tau \varkappa_a^{(n)}(y)),\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used that the computation for w' is analogous to the one developed for w just above. Since y is arbitrary, the result follows. □

Lemma 5.5 (Continuation property)**.** *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. If $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ satisfies $\varkappa_a(x) \in E_a(\tau)$, then $\varkappa_{c_1^x}(S(x)) \in E_{c_1^x}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau)$, where S is the left shift map. Moreover,*

$$\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x)) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau\beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^x)) + |\beta|^{-1} v_{c_1^x}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau).$$

Similarly, if $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ satisfies $\varkappa_a(x) \in E_a^{(n)}(\tau)$ for an integer $n \geq 1$, then we have that $\varkappa_{c_1^x}(S(x)) \in E_{c_1^x}^{(n-1)}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau)$ and

$$\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a^{(n-1)}(x)) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau\beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^x)) + |\beta|^{-1} v_{c_1^x}^{(n-1)}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ as in the hypothesis and assume $\varkappa_{c_1^x}(S(x)) \notin E_{c_1^x}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau)$. Then there exists $y \in \mathcal{S}_{c_1^x}$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau\varkappa_{c_1^x}(y)) < \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau\varkappa_{c_1^x}(S(x)))$. Clearly $(p_1^x, c_1^x, s_1^x)y \in \mathcal{S}_a$. Therefore, from the identities $\varkappa_a(x) = \beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^x) + \beta^{-1}\varkappa_{c_1^x}(S(x))$ and $\varkappa_a((p_1^x, c_1^x, s_1^x)y)) = \beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^x) + \beta^{-1}\varkappa_{c_1^x}(y)$, we deduce that

$$\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a((p_1^x, c_1^x, s_1^x)y)) < \mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x)),$$

which contradicts the fact that x is an extreme point in $E_a(\tau)$.
The equality

$$\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x)) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau\beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^x)) + |\beta|^{-1} v_{c_1^x}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau)$$

follows directly from the fact that $\varkappa_{c_1^x}(S(x)) \in E_{c_1^x}(\beta_0^{-1}\tau)$. The rest of the proof follows analogously.

□

Lemma 5.6 (Exponential approximation)**.** *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. For all $n \geq 1$ we have $|v_a^{(n)}(\tau) - v_a(\tau)| \leq C|\beta|^{-n}$, where $C = \max\{-v_b(\tau); b \in \mathcal{A}, \tau \in \mathbb{S}^1\} < \infty$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ with $\varkappa_a(x) \in E_a(\tau)$. Then,

$$v_a(\tau) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x)) \leq v_a^{(n)}(\tau) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a^{(n)}(x)).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |v_a^{(n)}(\tau) - v_a(\tau)| = v_a^{(n)}(\tau) - v_a(\tau) &\leq -\mathrm{Re}\left(\tau \sum_{m\geq n+1} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x)\right) \\ &= -|\beta|^{-n} v_{c_n^x}(\beta_0^{-n}\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the Continuation Property of Lemma 5.5. □

Lemma 5.7. *For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, eventually periodic elements of $\mathcal{S}_a$ do not produce extreme points in $\mathfrak{F}_a$.*

Proof. Let x be an eventually periodic element of $\mathcal{S}_a$. Then, there exist nonnegative integers n_0 and q such that for every $k \geq 0$ and $1 \leq m \leq q$ we have

$$(p^x_{n_0+kq+m}, c^x_{n_0+kq+m}, s^x_{n_0+kq+m}) = (p_m, c_m, s_m).$$

Assume that $\varkappa_a(x)$ is an extreme point for the direction $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. By definition and periodicity, for every $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x)) \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\left(\tau \sum_{m=1}^{n_0+kq} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x)\right) + |\beta|^{-n_0-kq}\,\mathrm{Re}\left(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau \sum_{j\geq 1} \beta^{-j}\gamma(p^x_{n_0+kq+j})\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\left(\tau \sum_{m=1}^{n_0+kq} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x)\right) + |\beta|^{-n_0-kq}\,\mathrm{Re}\left(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau \sum_{j\geq 0} \beta^{-jq} \sum_{m=1}^{q} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Define $z = \sum_{j\geq 0} \beta^{-jq} \sum_{m=1}^{q} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m)$, then,

$$\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x)) = \mathrm{Re}\left(\tau \sum_{m=1}^{n_0+kq} \beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^x)\right) + |\beta|^{-n_0-kq}\,\mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau z).$$

By Lemma 5.5, $\mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau z) = v_{c^x_{n_0+kq}}(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau) = v_{c_q}(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau)$. Thus $\mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau z) \leq 0$ for any $k \geq 0$. Since $(\beta_0^{-kq})_{k\geq 0}$ is dense in $\mathbb{S}^1$, we deduce that $z = 0$ and consequently $v_{c_q}(\beta_0^{-n_0-kq}\tau) = 0$ for every $k \geq 0$. Finally, by continuity of v_a (Lemma 5.3) and density, $v_{c_q}(\xi) = 0$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Since $\mathfrak{F}_{c_q}$ is not reduced to $\{0\}$ we get a contradiction. □

We remark that from previous lemma one deduces that $v_a(\tau) < 0$ for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Indeed, we know that $v_a(\tau) \leq 0$, but if $v_a(\tau) = 0$ then we would have that $0 \in \mathfrak{F}_a$ is an extreme point, which contradicts the previous lemma.

5.2. The set Ψ and extreme points.

Definition 5.8. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $(p, c, s) \in \mathcal{A}^* \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}^*$ such that $\sigma(a) = pcs$. We denote by $\mathcal{S}_{a,(p,c,s)}$ the set of sequences $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ starting with $x_1 = (p, c, s)$. We define*

$$\mathfrak{F}_{a,(p,c,s)} = \{\varkappa_a(x); x \in \mathcal{S}_{a,(p,c,s)}\} = \beta^{-1}(\gamma(p) + \mathfrak{F}_c) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_a.$$



FIGURE 2. In the Arnoux-Yoccoz example we show directions in Ψ_1.

For a direction $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$, we define $v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau) = \min\{\mathrm{Re}(\tau z); z \in \mathfrak{F}_{a,(p,c,s)}\}$ and $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau) = E_a(\tau) \cap \mathfrak{F}_{a,(p,c,s)}$.

It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{F}_a = \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_{a,(p,s,c)}$ and that $v_a(\tau) = \min\{v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)\}$, where the union and the minimum are taken over the $(p, c, s) \in \mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{A}^* \times \mathscr{A}$ such that $\sigma(a) = pcs$.

Definition 5.9. *For each $a \in \mathscr{A}$ we define Ψ_a as the set of directions $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ for which there exist distinct decompositions $\sigma(a) = pcs = qbr$ in $\mathscr{A}^* \times \mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{A}^*$ with $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau) \neq E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$ and $v_a(\tau) = v_{a,(p,c,s)(\tau)} = v_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$. That is, Ψ_a is the set of directions for which there exist distinct extreme points in $\mathfrak{F}_a$ belonging to distinct subfractals $\mathfrak{F}_{a,(p,c,s)}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ (see Figure 2). Put $\Psi = \bigcup_{a\in\mathscr{A}} \Psi_a$.*

Lemma 5.10. *For each $a \in \mathscr{A}$ the set Ψ_a is at most countable.*

Proof. Let $a \in \mathscr{A}$. We will prove that the set $\Psi'_a = \{\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1; |E_a(\tau)| \geq 2\}$, which clearly contains Ψ_a, is at most countable.
Let $Z \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. We define the set of extreme points of Z for the direction τ as $E_Z(\tau) = \{z \in Z; \mathrm{Re}(\tau z) = \min\{\mathrm{Re}(\tau z'); z' \in Z\}\}$. Similarly, we define the set of directions in $\mathbb{S}^1$ for which there exist at least two distinct extreme points as $\Psi'_Z(\tau) = \{\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1; |E_Z(\tau)| \geq 2\}$. We denote the convex hull of Z by $\mathrm{conv}(Z)$.
We have that $E_a(\tau) = E_{\mathfrak{F}_a}(\tau)$, $\Psi'_a(\tau) = \Psi'_{\mathfrak{F}_a}(\tau)$, $E_{\mathrm{conv}(\mathfrak{F}_a)}(\tau) = \mathrm{conv}(E_a(\tau))$ and that $\Psi'_{\mathrm{conv}(\mathfrak{F}_a)} = \Psi'_a$, since $|E_a(\tau)| \geq 2$ if and only if $|\mathrm{conv}(E_a(\tau))| \geq 2$.
Since $\mathrm{conv}(\mathfrak{F}_a)$ is convex and compact, it is either a point, a line segment or homeomorphic to a closed disk. Since in the first two cases $\Psi'_{\mathrm{conv}(\mathfrak{F}_a)}$ is finite, we can assume that the third case holds. Let $\Phi\colon \mathbb{S}^1 \to \partial\mathrm{conv}(\mathfrak{F}_a)$ be an homeomorphism between $\mathbb{S}^1$ and the boundary of $\mathrm{conv}(\mathfrak{F}_a)$. We have that $\tau \in \Psi'_a$ if and only if the map $\mathrm{Re}(\tau\Phi)\colon \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ is constant on an open interval of $\mathbb{S}^1$. Since such open intervals must be disjoint for distinct τ's and a family of disjoint open subsets of $\mathbb{S}^1$ is at most countable, we obtain that Ψ'_a is at most countable. □

5.3. **Minimal sequences for γ and limit extreme points.** Points in $\mathcal{S}_a$ may be constructed by "reversing" the p.s.d. of elements in Ω_T. Moreover, minimal sequences in Ω_T for γ produce, by reversing its p.s.d., extreme points for any direction. We will make this statement precise in this section.
Consider a minimal sequence $\omega \in \Omega_T$ for γ and let $(p_m, c_m, s_m)_{m\geq 1}$ be its prefix-suffix decomposition. Fix some $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and recall that $\beta_0 = \beta/|\beta|$ is not a root of

unity. Let $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be an increasing sequence of integers such that $\beta_0^{n_k} \to \tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $c_{n_k} = a \in \mathscr{A}$ for every $k \geq 1$. For each $k \geq 1$ consider a point $x_{n_k} \in \mathcal{S}_a$ starting with

$$(p_{n_k-1}, c_{n_k-1}, s_{n_k-1})(p_{n_k-2}c_{n_k-2}, s_{n_k-2}) \dots (p_0, c_0, s_0)$$

and such that $p_m^{x_{n_k}} = \varepsilon$ for any $m \geq n_k + 1$. This is a sequence obtained by reversing the indexes of finitely many elements of the prefix-suffix decomposition of ω. Assume $(x_{n_k})_{k\geq 1}$ converges to $x_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_a$. We will show that x_∞ is the representation of an extreme point in $\mathfrak{F}_a$ for the direction τ. In fact we can prove a little more. For this we need to introduce the following concept.

Definition 5.11. *A limit extreme point is an extreme point that has a representation $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ with the following property: for each $j \geq 1$ there exists $y_j \in \mathcal{S}_{a_j}$ for some $a_j \in \mathscr{A}$ such that*

(i) y_j is a representation of an extreme point for the direction $\beta_0^j\tau$;
(ii) $c_j^{y_j} = a$;
(iii) $x = S^j(y_j)$, where S is the left shift map on $\bigcup_{a\in\mathscr{A}} \mathcal{S}_a$.

The set of limit extreme points will be denoted by $E_a^*(\tau)$.

Lemma 5.12. *Any limit $x_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_a$, constructed as above, is a representation of a limit extreme point in $E_a^*(\tau)$.*

Proof. Assume the sequence constructed as before $(x_{n_k})_{k\geq 1}$ converges to $x_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_a$. For each integer $j \geq 0$, let $y_{n_k}^j$ be the sequence in $\mathcal{S}_{c_{n_k+j}}$ starting by

$$(p_{n_k+j-1}, c_{n_k+j-1}, s_{n_k+j-1})(p_{n_k+j-2}c_{n_k+j-2}, s_{n_k+j-2}) \dots (p_0, c_0, s_0),$$

and such that $p_m^{y_{n_k}^j} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq n_k + j + 1$. That is, $y_{n_k}^j$ is the sequence obtained by reversing the first $n_k + j$ elements of the p.s.d. $(p_m, c_m, s_m)_{m\geq 0}$ of ω. Clearly, $S^j(y_{n_k}^j) = x_{n_k}$. By taking a subsequence we may assume that $c_{n_k+j} = a_j$ for every $k \geq 1$ and that $y_{n_k}^j$ converges to y_j when $k \to \infty$. We clearly have that $c_j^{y_j} = a$ and $S^j(y_j) = x_\infty$.
We claim that both x_∞ and y_j are representations of extreme points for the letters a and a_j and the directions τ and $\beta_0^j\tau$ respectively. Indeed, since ω is a minimal sequence for γ, by Lemma 4.5 we have that x_{n_k} satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.4 (taking $\tau = 1$ in the lemma), so $v_a^{(n_k)}(\beta_0^{n_k}) = \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{n_k}\varkappa_a(x_{n_k}))$. Thus for every $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ we have that $\mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{n_k}\varkappa_a(x_{n_k})) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{n_k}\varkappa_a^{(n_k)}(x))$. Finally, taking the limit when $k \to \infty$ we get that $\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x_\infty)) \leq \mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x))$ for any $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$, so x_∞ is an extreme point in $E_a(\tau)$. The proof for y_j is similar. □

The previous lemma gives us the following important corollary:

Corollary 5.13. *For every $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ there exists $a \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $E_a^*(\tau)$ is nonempty. Moreover, if $E_a^*(\tau)$ is nonempty for some $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$, then $E_a^*(\tau) = E_a(\tau)$*

Proof. Take a minimal sequence $\omega \in \Omega_T$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. By reversing the p.s.d. of ω as above on an appropriate sequence $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ such that $\beta_0^{n_k} \to \tau$, we obtain by previous lemma that $E_a^*(\tau) \neq \varnothing$ for some $a \in \mathscr{A}$. Now, if $E_a^*(\tau)$ is nonempty for some $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$, let $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ be a representation of a limit extreme point in $E_a^*(\tau)$, for every $j \geq 1$ let $y_j \in \mathcal{S}_{a_j}$ be the sequence from the definition of limit extreme point and let $x' \in \mathcal{S}_a$ be the representation of some extreme point in $E_a(\tau)$. For every $j \geq 1$ we define $y'_j \in \mathcal{S}_a$ to coincide with y_j in its first j coordinates and

with x' in the rest of its coordinates. A direct computation shows that $y'_j \in \mathcal{S}_{a_j}$ and that it is the representation of an extreme point in $E_{a_j}(\beta_0^j \tau)$ such that $S^j(y'_j) = x'$ and $c_j^{y'_j} = a$. □

Even though for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ one has that $E_a(\tau)$ is nonempty, in general $E_a^*(\tau)$ may be empty. Indeed, the Arnoux-Yoccoz fractals contain extreme points that are not limit extreme points.
Another interesting consequence of Lemma 5.12 is the following:

Lemma 5.14. *If $\omega \in \Omega_T$ has an eventually periodic p.s.d., then it cannot be minimal for any eigenvector γ associated with β.*

Proof. If it were, then using the reversing procedure described above Lemma 5.12 we could construct a limit extreme point with periodic representation. This contradicts Lemma 5.7. □

6. Unique representation property

We continue with notations of previous sections. So, T is a self-similar interval exchange map, which is self-induced on the interval $[0, \alpha)$, and β is a non real eigenvalue of M which is Galois-conjugate with α. Consider an eigenvector γ of M associated to β.
Recall that $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ is a representation of $z \in \mathfrak{F}_a$ if $z = \varkappa_a(x)$.

Definition 6.1. *We say that T satisfies the* unique representation property *(u.r.p.) for β and the eigenvector γ if every extreme point has a unique representation. We say that T satisfies the* weak unique representation property *(weak u.r.p.) for β and the eigenvector γ if every limit extreme point has a unique representation.*

By Corollary 5.13, if T satisfies the weak u.r.p. for β and the eigenvector γ, then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $E_a^*(\tau)$ in nonempty, we have that every extreme point of $\mathfrak{F}_a$ for the direction τ has a unique representation. Indeed, in this case $E_a(\tau) = E_a^*(\tau)$. In particular, if $\sigma(a) = pcs = qbr$ for distinct decompositions in $\mathcal{A}^* \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}^*$, then $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau) \cap E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$ is empty.
Before continuing we need to comment the dependence of the previous concepts on the eigenvector γ. Until now, we have fixed an eigenvector γ associated with β and defined the fractal set $\mathfrak{F}_a$, its extreme and limit extreme points for a given direction $E_a(\tau)$ and $E_a^*(\tau)$, and the directions with extreme points in distinct subfractals Ψ_a. These objects clearly depend on the choice of γ. We will temporarily make this dependence explicit by writing $\mathfrak{F}_a(\gamma)$, $E_a(\gamma, \tau)$, $E_a^*(\gamma, \tau)$ and $\Psi_a(\gamma)$ respectively. Since we are assuming that β is Galois-conjugate with α, by Lemma 3.2, the eigenspace associated with β has dimension 1. Our main concern is to see how these concepts vary with γ in this one dimensional space. The following relations follow easily from definitions:

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\gamma, z\gamma \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{A}}$ be eigenvectors associated with β, with $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Then,*

(i) $\mathfrak{F}_a(z\gamma) = z\mathfrak{F}_a(\gamma)$;
(ii) $E_a(z\gamma, \tau) = z_0 E_a(\gamma, \tau)$, $E_a^*(z\gamma, \tau) = z_0 E_a^*(\gamma, \tau)$;
(iii) $\Psi_a(z\gamma) = z_0 \Psi_a(\gamma)$,

where $z_0 = z/|z|$.

From this lemma we deduce that if the (weak) unique representation property holds for an eigenvector γ associated to β then it holds for $z\gamma$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Since the geometric multiplicity of β is one, then this property depends only on T and β. Hence under our hypotheses we can speak about the (weak) u.r.p. for β avoiding the eigenvector γ. We will prove in Section 8 that the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz example satisfies the unique representation property.

7. Proof of the main Theorem

We restate our main theorem for completeness. We continue with the notations of the three previous sections.

Theorem A. *Let T be a self-similar i.e.m. Assume that M has a non real eigenvalue β with $|\beta| > 1$ and which is Galois-conjugate with α. If T has the weak unique representation property for β, then, for almost all complex eigenvector γ associated with β, the vector $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma)$ can be realized as the logarithm of the slope vector of an affine i.e.m. which is semi-conjugate with T and has wandering intervals.*

Of course, affine i.e.m.'s with wandering intervals cannot be conjugate with T, so the theorem asserts the existence of affine i.e.m.'s strictly semi-conjugate with T. We remark that each of these affine i.e.m.'s is uniquely ergodic, since T is.

The (weak) unique representation property may seem technical and difficult to check for a specific example. In the next section we prove that this property is attained by the Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m. Also, in a work-in-progress we explore algebraic and geometric conditions ensuring it.

As discussed in Section 2, using the general strategy of [CG97] the proof of Theorem A is a consequence of the following more technical statement that we prove in the next section.

Theorem 7.1. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem A, there exists a number $\rho > 0$ such that for almost all complex eigenvector γ associated with β and every minimal sequence $\omega \in \Omega_T$ for the vector γ, we have that*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega))}{n^\rho} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_{-n}(\omega))}{n^\rho} > 0, \tag{5}$$

where $\gamma_n(\omega) = \gamma_{\omega_0} + \cdots + \gamma_{\omega_{n-1}}$ and $\gamma_{-n}(\omega) = -(\gamma_{\omega_{-n}} + \cdots + \gamma_{\omega_{-1}})$ for $n \geq 1$.

Following in details the proof of Theorems A and 7.1 below one observes that it is possible to change the condition "β is Galois-conjugate with α" with the fact that "$\beta_0 = \beta/|\beta|$ is not a root of unity". This new hypothesis produces the same conclusion of Theorem A but only for some eigenvectors γ associated with β. Nevertheless, we think that the algebraic condition on β is necessary (and even natural) for the theorem and that it will be unavoidable to ensure the (weak) unique representation property.

We state this version of the main theorem without proof. Here, since we will not consider the Galois-conjugacy of β with α, the unique representation property depends on β and γ.

Theorem 7.2. *Let T be a self-similar i.e.m. Assume that M has a non real eigenvalue β such that $|\beta| > 1$ with irrational angle and let γ be an associated eigenvector. If T has the weak u.r.p. for β and γ, then, for almost every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the vector $\mathrm{Re}(z\gamma)$ can be realized as the logarithm of the slope vector of an affine i.e.m. which is semi-conjugate with T and has wandering intervals.*

7.1. **Proof of Theorem 7.1.**

7.1.1. *Differentiability of v_a.* We start by describing some differentiability properties of the map $v_a\colon \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. One has*

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{v_a(\tau\exp(it)) - v_a(\tau)}{t} = -\operatorname{Im}(\tau e_a^+(\tau)),$$
$$\lim_{t\to 0^-} \frac{v_a(\tau\exp(it)) - v_a(\tau)}{t} = -\operatorname{Im}(\tau e_a^-(\tau)),$$

where $e_a^+(\tau), e_a^-(\tau)$ are the points of $E_a(\tau)$ such that $z \mapsto \operatorname{Im}(\tau z)$ is maximal and minimal respectively.

Proof. We will only prove the first equality, since the second one is analogous. Let $z = e_a^+(\tau), z_t \in E_a(\tau\exp(it))$ and let us write $\tau z = r\exp(i\theta)$ and $\tau z_t = r_t\exp(i\theta_t)$ for $r, r_t > 0$, $\theta, \theta_t \in [0, 2\pi)$. We will assume that $0 < t < \pi/2$.
Since $z = e_a^+(\tau)$ and $z_t \in E_a(\tau\exp(it))$, we have that $v_a(\tau) = \operatorname{Re}(\tau z) = r\cos(\theta)$, $v_a(\tau\exp(it)) = \operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z_t) = r_t\cos(\theta_t + t)$ and $-\operatorname{Im}(\tau e_a^+(\tau)) = -r\sin(\theta)$. Thus, we have to prove that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{r_t\cos(\theta_t + t) - r\cos(\theta)}{t} = -r\sin(\theta).$$

Since $z_t \in E_a(\tau\exp(it))$, we have that

$$r\cos(\theta + t) = \operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z) \geq \operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z_t) = r_t\cos(\theta_t + t).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq r_t\cos(\theta_t + t) - r\cos(\theta + t) \\ &= (r_t\cos(\theta_t) - r\cos(\theta))\cos(t) + (r\sin(\theta) - r_t\sin(\theta_t))\sin(t). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Moreover, since $z \in E_a(\tau)$ we have that $r\cos(\theta) = \operatorname{Re}(\tau z) \leq \operatorname{Re}(\tau z_t) = r_t\cos(\theta_t)$. We conclude that $(r_t\cos(\theta_t) - r\cos(\theta))\cos(t) \geq 0$ for t small enough. Therefore, from $\sin(t) > 0$ and (6) we have that $r\sin(\theta) - r_t\sin(\theta_t)$ cannot be positive. This proves that $\operatorname{Im}(\tau z) = r\sin(\theta) \leq r_t\sin(\theta_t) = \operatorname{Im}(\tau z_t)$.
We claim that $\lim_{t\to 0^+}\operatorname{Im}(\tau z_t) = \operatorname{Im}(\tau z)$. Indeed, fix a real $\eta > 0$ and consider

$$u(t) = \min\{\operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z'); z' \in \mathfrak{F}_a, \operatorname{Im}(\tau z') \geq \operatorname{Im}(\tau z) + \eta\}.$$

Since z is in $E_a(\tau)$ and is chosen with the maximal possible value for $\operatorname{Im}(\tau z)$, we have that $\operatorname{Re}(\tau z) < u(0)$. The map $u\colon [0, \pi/2) \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, so there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z) < \operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z')$ for every $0 \leq t < t_0$ and $z' \in \mathfrak{F}_a$ such that $\operatorname{Im}(\tau z') \geq \operatorname{Im}(\tau z) + \eta$. Therefore, if $0 \leq t < t_0$ and $\operatorname{Im}(\tau z_t) \geq \operatorname{Im}(\tau z) + \eta$, then $\operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z) < \operatorname{Re}(\tau\exp(it)z_t)$, which contradicts the fact that $z_t \in E_a(\tau\exp(it))$. This shows that $\operatorname{Im}(\tau z_t) < \operatorname{Im}(\tau z) + \eta$ for $0 \leq t < t_0$, so we get the desired result by taking $\eta \to 0$.
The previous claim and (6) imply that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{r_t\cos(\theta_t + t) - r\cos(\theta + t)}{t} \geq \lim_{t\to 0^+} (\operatorname{Im}(\tau z_t) - \operatorname{Im}(\tau z))\frac{\sin(t)}{t} = 0.$$

Finally, we write

$$\frac{v_a(\tau\exp(it)) - v_a(\tau)}{t} = \frac{r_t\cos(\theta_t + t) - r\cos(\theta + t)}{t} + \frac{r\cos(\theta + t) - r\cos(\theta)}{t},$$

and the result follows by taking $t \to 0^+$. □

7.1.2. *Good directions and good eigenvectors.* In order to prove the convergences in (5) we need to control the velocity at which β_0^n approaches a number τ in $\mathbb{S}^1$. In what follows $[\![\tau - \tau']\!]$ is the natural distance between τ and τ' in $\mathbb{S}^1$.

Definition 7.4. *A complex number $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is a* good direction *if for every constant $A > 1$ and every $\tau \in \Psi = \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \Psi_a$ we have $\liminf_{n\to\infty} A^n [\![\xi\tau - \beta_0^n]\!] > 0$.*

We will show that under the hypotheses of the main theorem almost every direction is good.

Lemma 7.5. *Almost every direction $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is good.*

Proof. Let $A > 1$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. We will first prove that

$$K(A,\tau) = \left\{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1; \liminf_{n\to\infty} A^n [\![\xi\tau - \beta_0^n]\!] > 0\right\}$$

has full Lebesgue measure. Consider the sets $B_n = \{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1; [\![\xi\tau - \beta_0^n]\!] < A^{-n}\}$ for an integer $n \geq 0$. By the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, the Lebesgue measure of $\limsup_{n\to\infty} B_n$ is zero. That is, the set of ξ which belong to infinitely many of the B_n's has Lebesgue measure zero. This implies that for a typical $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ there exists some $N \geq 1$ such that $A^n [\![\xi\tau - \beta_0^n]\!] \geq 1$ if $n \geq N$. This proves the claim.
Now, since by Lemma 5.10 we have that Ψ is at most countable, the intersection $K(A) = \bigcap_{\tau\in\Psi} K(A,\tau)$ also has full Lebesgue measure. Finally, the intersection $K = \bigcap_{n\geq 1} K(1 + 1/n)$ has full Lebesgue measure and it is easy to see that every element of K is a good direction. □

We can now define the eigenvectors for which our main result is valid:

Definition 7.6. *An eigenvector γ of M associated with β is a* good eigenvector *if for every $A > 1$ and every $\tau \in \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \Psi_a$ we have $\liminf_{n\to\infty} A^n [\![\tau - \beta_0^n]\!] > 0$.*

By Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 7.5, we conclude that

Lemma 7.7. *Almost every eigenvector γ associated with β is good.*

7.1.3. *Convergence in Theorem 7.1.* In this section we show the convergence in (5) if γ is a good eigenvector. Since γ will be a fixed good eigenvector, we will continue omitting the dependence on γ. The proof of the next lemma and proposition closes the proof of Theorem 7.1 and thus of Theorem A.
We start with a technical lemma.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in \Psi_a$. Assume that $(p,c,s),(q,b,r)$ are such that $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)$ and $E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$ are nonempty but $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau) \cap E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau) = \varnothing$. Put*

$$D = \min\{|z' - z|; z' \in E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau), z \in E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)\}.$$

We have that $D > 0$ and if $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is a sequence in $\mathbb{S}^1$ such that $\tau_k \to \tau$ when $k \to \infty$, then

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{|v_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau_k) - v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau_k)|}{[\![\tau - \tau_k]\!]} \geq D.$$

Proof. See Figure 3 for an insight into the proof, which is in fact a little technical. The property $D > 0$ is consequence of the fact that $E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$ and $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)$ are nonempty, disjoint and compact.



FIGURE 3. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 7.8.

Let $(x_k)_{k\geq 1}, (y_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be sequences in $\mathcal{S}_{a,(p,c,s)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ respectively, such that $x_k \to x_\infty$ and $y_k \to y_\infty$ when $k \to \infty$ for some sequences in $x_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_{a,(p,c,s)}$ and $y_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ and

$$v_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau_k) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau_k \varkappa_a(y_k)), \quad v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau_k) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau_k \varkappa_a(x_k))$$

for all $k \geq 1$. We remark that $\varkappa_a(x_k)$ and $\varkappa_a(y_k)$ attain the minimum for the direction τ_k and the subfractals $\mathfrak{F}_{a,(p,c,s)}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ respectively, but not necessarily for $\mathfrak{F}_a$, as Figure 3 illustrates.

By continuity and the fact that $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)$ and $E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$ are nonempty by hypotheses, we have $\varkappa_a(x_\infty) \in E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)$ and $\varkappa_a(y_\infty) \in E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$. Therefore,

$$v_a(\tau) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau \varkappa_a(x_\infty)) = \mathrm{Re}(\tau \varkappa_a(y_\infty)). \tag{7}$$

From the definition of D,

$$|\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau(\varkappa_a(y_\infty) - \varkappa_a(x_\infty))| \geq D. \tag{8}$$

Since $x_k \to x_\infty$ and $y_k \to y_\infty$, there exists an increasing sequence $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ such that $(p_m^{x_k}, c_m^{x_k}, s_m^{x_k}) = (p_m^{x_\infty}, c_m^{x_\infty}, s_m^{x_\infty})$ and $(p_m^{y_k}, c_m^{y_k}, s_m^{y_k}) = (p_m^{y_\infty}, c_m^{y_\infty}, s_m^{y_\infty})$ for every $1 \leq m \leq n_k$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $c_{n_k}^{x_k} = c_{n_k}^{x_\infty} = c'$ and that $c_{n_k}^{y_k} = c_{n_k}^{y_\infty} = b'$ for every $k \geq 1$.

Let S be the left shift in $\bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{S}_a$. Recall that, from the continuation property in Lemma 5.5, if $x \in \mathcal{S}_a$ represents an extreme point for the direction τ then $S^m(x) \in \mathcal{S}_{c_m^x}$ represents an extreme point for the direction $\beta_0^{-m}\tau$, for every integer $m \geq 0$. Consequently, we obtain that $v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k) = \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k \varkappa_{c'}(S^{n_k}(x_k)))$ and $v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) = \mathrm{Re}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau \varkappa_{c'}(S^{n_k}(x_\infty)))$ for every $k \geq 1$.

Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(x_\infty)) - \mathrm{Re}(\tau_k\varkappa_a(x_k)) &= \mathrm{Re}((\tau - \tau_k)(\beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^{x_\infty}) + \cdots + \beta^{-n_k}\gamma(p_{n_k}^{x_\infty}))) \\ &\quad + |\beta|^{-n_k}(v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) - v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k)).\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Analogously,

(10)
$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(y_\infty)) - \mathrm{Re}(\tau_k\varkappa_a(y_k)) = \mathrm{Re}((\tau-\tau_k)(\beta^{-1}\gamma(p_1^{y_\infty}) + \cdots + \beta^{-n_k}\gamma(p_{n_k}^{y_\infty})))\\ + |\beta|^{-n_k}(v_{b'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) - v_{b'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k)).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by taking (9) − (10), multiplying by $[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]^{-1}$ and using (7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau_k) - v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau_k)}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]} &= \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\tau-\tau_k}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]}\left(\varkappa_a^{(n_k)}(x_\infty) - \varkappa_a^{(n_k)}(y_\infty)\right)\right)\\ &+ |\beta|^{-n_k}\left(\frac{v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) - v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k)}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]}\right)\\ &- |\beta|^{-n_k}\left(\frac{v_{b'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) - v_{b'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k)}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Since $[\![\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau - \beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k]\!] = [\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]$, Lemma 7.3 implies that the quotients

$$\frac{v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) - v_{c'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k)}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{b'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau) - v_{b'}(\beta_0^{-n_k}\tau_k)}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]}$$

remain bounded for every $k \geq 1$, so the last two terms in the previous equality goes to 0 when $k \to \infty$. Now, if τ, τ' belong to $\mathbb{S}^1$ then

$$\lim_{\tau'\to\tau} \frac{\tau-\tau'}{[\![\tau-\tau']\!]} = i\tau$$

and therefore

$$\mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\tau-\tau_k}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]}\left(\varkappa_a^{(n_k)}(x_\infty) - \varkappa_a^{(n_k)}(y_\infty)\right)\right)$$

converges to $\mathrm{Re}(i\tau(\varkappa_a(x_\infty) - \varkappa_a(y_\infty)))$ when $k \to \infty$, which is the imaginary part of $\tau(\varkappa_a(x_\infty) - \varkappa_a(y_\infty))$. Finally, we obtain that when $k \to \infty$:

$$\frac{|v_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau_k) - v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau_k)|}{[\![\tau-\tau_k]\!]} \to |\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau(\varkappa_a(y_\infty) - \varkappa_a(x_\infty))| \geq D,$$

where in the last inequality we have used (8). □

Proposition 7.9. *Under the conditions of Theorem A, assume that γ is a good eigenvector for β and that $\omega \in \Omega_T$ is a minimal sequence for γ. Let $\eta > 0$ with $|\beta| - \eta > 1$ and let $\rho = \frac{\log(|\beta|-\eta)}{\log(\alpha^{-1}+\eta)} > 0$. Then,*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_n(\omega))}{n^\rho} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_{-n}(\omega))}{n^\rho} > 0. \tag{12}$$

Proof. We will only prove the first inequality, since the other one is similar.
We denote the p.s.d. of ω by $(p_m^\omega, c_m^\omega, s_m^\omega)_{m\geq 0}$. Let us assume that there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\gamma_{n_k}(\omega))}{n_k^\rho} = 0. \tag{13}$$

Let $(p_m^{\omega_k}, c_m^{\omega_k}, s_m^{\omega_k})_{m\geq 0}$ be the p.s.d. of $\omega_k = S^{n_k}(\omega)$, where as usual S is the left shift map on the corresponding subshift. We start by showing that ω must have infinitely many nonempty suffixes in its p.s.d. Indeed, assume by contradiction that $s_{n_0+m}^\omega = \varepsilon$ for some integer $n_0 \geq 0$ and every $m \geq 0$. We will show that $(p_m^\omega, c_m^\omega, s_m^\omega)_{m\geq 0}$ is eventually periodic, which contradicts Lemma 5.14. We have

that $\sigma(c^{\omega}_{n_0+m+1}) = p^{\omega}_{n_0+m}c^{\omega}_{n_0+m}$ for every $m \geq 0$. Then, for every $m \geq 0$, the value of $c^{\omega}_{n_0+m+1}$ determines a unique possible value for $p^{\omega}_{n_0+m}$ and $c^{\omega}_{n_0+m}$. By induction, it is easy to see that $(p^{\omega}_m, c^{\omega}_m, s^{\omega}_m)_{m\geq n_0}$ is periodic.
Let N_k be the first integer such that $(p^{\omega}_m, c^{\omega}_m, s^{\omega}_m)_{m\geq N_k} = (p^{\omega_k}_m, c^{\omega_k}_m, s^{\omega_k}_m)_{m\geq N_k}$. By taking a subsequence we can assume that $(N_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is an increasing sequence of integers. Moreover, we may assume that for $k \geq 1$:

(i) $c^{\omega}_{N_k} = c^{\omega_k}_{N_k} = a$;
(ii) $(p^{\omega}_{N_k-1}, c^{\omega}_{N_k-1}, s^{\omega}_{N_k-1}) = (p, c, s)$;
(iii) $(p^{\omega_k}_{N_k-1}, c^{\omega_k}_{N_k-1}, s^{\omega_k}_{N_k-1}) = (q, b, r)$;
(iv) pc is a prefix of q;
(v) $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_0^{N_k} = \tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$.

Since pc is a prefix of q, we have that

$$\sigma^{N_k-1}(p^{\omega_k}_{N_k-1})\dots p_0^{\omega_k} = \sigma^{N_k-1}(p^{\omega}_{N_k-1})\dots p_0^{\omega}\omega_0\dots\omega_{n_k-1} \tag{14}$$

for every $k \geq 1$.
We will now proceed to reverse the indexes of the prefix-suffix decompositions of ω and ω_k in order to obtain sequences in $\mathcal{S}_a$. Let $(x_{N_k})_{k\geq 1}$ and $(y_{N_k})_{k\geq 1}$ be the sequences in $\mathcal{S}_a$, obtained by reversing the coordinates of $(p^{\omega}_m, c^{\omega}_m, s^{\omega}_m)_{m\geq 0}$ and $(p^{\omega_k}_m, c^{\omega_k}_m, p^{\omega_k}_m)_{m\geq 0}$ up to the (N_k-1)-th coordinate and such that $p_m^{x_{N_k}} = p_m^{y_{N_k}} = \varepsilon$ for each $m \geq N_k$, as detailed at the beginning of Section 5.3. By the assumptions above, $x_{N_k} \in \mathcal{S}_{a,(p,c,s)}$ and $y_{N_k} \in \mathcal{S}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ for every $k \geq 1$.
Without loss of generality, we will assume that x_{N_k} converges to $x_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_{a,(p,c,s)}$, which is the representation of a limit extreme point in $E_a^*(\tau)$ by Lemma 5.12. We will show that any limit point of y_{N_k} in $\mathcal{S}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ is the representation of an extreme point in $E_a(\tau)$ and therefore that τ belongs to Ψ_a.

Applying γ to (14), using the definitions of x_{N_k}, y_{N_k} and multiplying by $|\beta|^{-N_k}$, we get that for every $k \geq 1$:

$$\beta_0^{N_k}\sum_{m=1}^{N_k}\beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^{y_{N_k}}) = \beta_0^{N_k}\sum_{m=1}^{N_k}\beta^{-m}\gamma(p_m^{x_{N_k}}) + |\beta|^{-N_k}\gamma_{n_k}(\omega).$$

By taking real parts and rearranging the previous expression we obtain:

$$\operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}(\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}) - \varkappa_a(x_{N_k}))) = |\beta|^{-N_k}\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{n_k}(\omega)).$$

Furthermore, $\operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}\varkappa_a(x_{N_k})) \leq \operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}))$ by Lemma 5.4. Then we get

$$0 \leq \operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}(\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}) - \varkappa_a(x_{N_k}))) = |\beta|^{-N_k}\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{n_k}(\omega)). \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, since $\omega_0\omega_1\dots\omega_{n_k-1}$ is a subword of $\sigma^{N_k}(a)$ and $|\sigma^{N_k}(a)|$ grows as α^{-N_k} (recall that $\alpha^{-1} > 1$ is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of M), we have that $n_k \leq (\alpha^{-1}+\eta)^{N_k}$ for sufficiently large $k \geq 1$, where $\eta > 0$ was given in the statement of the proposition. Therefore, by definition of ρ,

$$n_k^{-\rho} \geq (\alpha^{-1}+\eta)^{-N_k\rho} = (|\beta|-\eta)^{-N_k} \geq |\beta|^{-N_k}.$$

From the assumption (13), we obtain that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}(|\beta|-\eta)^{-N_k}\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{n_k}(\omega)) = \lim_{k\to\infty}|\beta|^{-N_k}\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{n_k}(\omega)) = 0.$$

In particular, from equation (15) we obtain that any limit point y_∞ of y_{N_k} in $\mathcal{S}_{a,(q,b,r)}$ is such that $\varkappa_a(y_\infty)$ is an extreme point for the direction $\tau = \lim_{k\to\infty}\beta_0^{N_k}$: $v_a(\tau) = \operatorname{Re}(\tau\varkappa_a(y_\infty))$. Therefore, τ belongs to Ψ_a.

Amplifying equation (15) by A^{N_k}, where $A = \frac{|\beta|}{|\beta|-\eta} \in (1, |\beta|)$, we find that

$$0 \leq A^{N_k} \operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}(\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}) - \varkappa_a(x_{N_k}))) = (|\beta| - \eta)^{-N_k} \operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{n_k}(\omega))$$

for all sufficiently large k. Hence,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} A^{N_k} \operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}(\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}) - \varkappa_a(x_{N_k}))) = 0. \tag{16}$$

We know from Lemma 5.4 that

$$v_a^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) = v_{a,(p,c,s)}^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) = \operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}\varkappa_a(x_{N_k})).$$

We also know that $\operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}\varkappa_a(y_{N_k})) \geq v_{a,(q,b,r)}^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k})$ and therefore that

$$\operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}(\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}) - \varkappa_a(x_{N_k}))) \geq v_{a,(q,b,r)}^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) - v_{a,(p,c,s)}^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) \geq 0. \tag{17}$$

On the other hand, since $x_\infty \in \delta_{a,(p,c,s)}$ and $y_\infty \in \delta_{a,(q,b,r)}$ are representations of extreme points for τ and since $\varkappa_a(x_\infty)$ is a limit extreme point, Corollary 5.13 implies that $E_a(\tau) = E_a^*(\tau)$. Then the weak u.r.p. implies that $E_{a,(p,c,s)}(\tau)$ and $E_{a,(q,b,r)}(\tau)$ are disjoint, so in particular $\varkappa_a(x_\infty) \neq \varkappa_a(y_\infty)$.
Using Lemma 5.6 we conclude that for each $k \geq 1$:

$$v_{a,(q,b,r)}^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) - v_{a,(p,c,s)}^{(N_k)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) \geq v_{a,(q,b,r)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) - v_{a,(p,c,s)}(\beta_0^{N_k}) - 2C|\beta|^{-N_k} \tag{18}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ which does not depend on k.
Finally, by (17), (18) and Lemma 7.8 we conclude that

$$\operatorname{Re}(\beta_0^{N_k}(\varkappa_a(y_{N_k}) - \varkappa_a(x_{N_k}))) \geq D[\![\tau - \beta_0^{N_k}]\!] - 2C|\beta|^{-N_k}$$

for infinitely many $k \geq 1$. Since γ is a good eigenvector and $\tau \in \Psi_a$, by definition, $\liminf_{k\to\infty} A^{N_k}[\![\tau - \beta_0^{N_k}]\!] = \infty$. This contradicts (16). □

8. The cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz example

In this section we illustrate Theorem A in the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m. (or A-Y i.e.m. for simplicity). This example is self-similar in the sense of [LPV08] but not in the sense of [CG97], which is the notion we are following in Theorem A. However, it satisfies all the other hypotheses of the theorem. Although the main theorem is written for self-similar i.e.m. in the sense of [CG97], this precise notion plays a role in very specific parts of the proof of the theorem:

(i) ensuring that the symbolic system associated with the i.e.m. is substitutive;
(ii) showing that the eigenspace associated to β has dimension 1 (Lemma 3.2) and concluding that β^n is never real for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (Corollary 3.3).

It is possible to address each of these issues for the specific case of the A-Y i.e.m. In addition, it is proved in [LPV08] that an induced system obtained from the A-Y i.e.m. with respect to a precise interval is a self-similar i.e.m. in the sense of [CG97], but the resulting substitution associated with the i.e.m. is unnecessarily complex to analyse. Nevertheless, some technical but not difficult modifications on the study that we will develop for the A-Y i.e.m. below allow to prove that the induced system also satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem A.



FIGURE 4. The compositions that produce the A-Y i.e.m. T. The dashed lines show the midpoints of the respective intervals.



FIGURE 5. The A-Y i.e.m. T.

8.1. **A-Y i.e.m.** Let α be the unique real number such that $\alpha + \alpha^2 + \alpha^3 = 1$ and let G_{t_0,t_1} be the map exchanging both halves of the interval $[t_0, t_1)$ while preserving orientation. That is,

$$G_{t_0,t_1}(t) = \begin{cases} t + (t_0 + t_1)/2 & t \in [t_0, (t_0 + t_1)/2), \\ t - (t_0 + t_1)/2 & t \in [(t_0 + t_1)/2, t_1), \\ t & t \notin [t_0, t_1). \end{cases}$$

Then, the A-Y i.e.m. is given by $T = G_{0,1} \circ G_{0,\alpha} \circ G_{\alpha,\alpha+\alpha^2} \circ G_{\alpha+\alpha^2,1}$ (see Figures 4 and 5 for clarity). Properties of T were extensively discussed in [ABB11]. In particular, it is proved that the map T is equal, up to rescaling and rotation, to the map induced on the interval $[0, \alpha)$ and, by considering an appropriate refinement of continuity intervals of T into nine intervals, one may encode the relation of orbits by T for this partition and the orbits of the induced system for the induced partition by the following substitution σ on the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \ldots, 9\}$:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \sigma(1) = 35 & \sigma(4) = 17 & \sigma(7) = 29 \\ \sigma(2) = 45 & \sigma(5) = 18 & \sigma(8) = 2 \\ \sigma(3) = 46 & \sigma(6) = 19 & \sigma(9) = 3 \end{array}$$

One then has that $\Omega_T = \Omega_\sigma$. It is easy to check that σ is primitive. This solves issue (i) at the beginning of the section.
Let M be the matrix associated with the substitution σ, that is,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its characteristic polynomial is $(1-t^3)(t^3+t^2+t-1)(-t^3+t^2+t+1)$, where the last two factors are irreducible. The roots of t^3+t^2+t-1 are α, β and $\bar{\beta}$, whereas the roots of $-t^3+t^2+t+1$ are α^{-1}, β^{-1} and $\bar{\beta}^{-1}$, where α^{-1} is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue. We assume that β is the eigenvalue with positive imaginary part. Numerically, $\beta \approx -0.771845 + 1.11514i$. It is proved in [Mes00] that $(\beta^{-1})^n$ is never real for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, we have that the eigenspace associated with β has dimension 1. In fact, it is generated by

$$\gamma = (\beta^2+\beta+1, -\beta, -\beta, -\beta^2-\beta-1, \beta+1, \beta+1, -\beta^2-\beta-2, -1, -1).$$

This solves issue (ii) at the beginning of the section.
In what follows β and γ are the corresponding eigenvalue and eigenvector of M used in the previous sections. Since we have solved the two issues, proving the u.r.p. for β is enough to conclude Theorem A for the Arnoux-Yoccoz example.

8.2. **Fractals associated with the A-Y i.e.m.** Theorem 6.4 of [ABB11] shows that the fractals defined in Section 5 exist and satisfy $\mathfrak{F}_2 = \mathfrak{F}_3$, $\mathfrak{F}_5 = \mathfrak{F}_6$ and $\mathfrak{F}_8 = \mathfrak{F}_9$. An illustration of each fractal is given in Figure 8. The boundaries of these fractals can be constructed by combining pieces of the boundary of the standard tribonnacci fractal and can therefore be parametrized as we will see later.

8.2.1. *Parametrization of the boundary of tribonnacci fractal.* First we state some important properties of the tribonnacci fractal. We will follow [Mes00] freely. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of sequences in $\{0,1\}$ without three consecutive 1's. The (standard) tribonnacci fractal is defined by

$$\mathfrak{R} = \left\{ \sum_{m\geq 3} \beta^{-m} a_{m-2}; (a_m)_{m\geq 1} \in \mathcal{N} \right\}.$$

For $(a_m)_{m\geq 1} \in \mathcal{N}$, we define $\boldsymbol{r}((a_m)_{m\geq 1}) = \sum_{m\geq 3} \beta^{-m} a_{m-2}$. For $z \in \mathfrak{R}$, we say that $(a_m)_{m\geq 1} \in \mathcal{N}$ is a *representation* of z if $z = \boldsymbol{r}((a_m)_{m\geq 1})$. Clearly, any sequence in $\mathcal{N}$ starts with either 0, 10 or 11. One has the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{R}_0 &= \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{R} = \{z \in \mathfrak{R}; z \text{ has a representation starting with } 0\},\\
\mathfrak{R}_{10} &= \beta^{-3} + \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{R} = \{z \in \mathfrak{R}; z \text{ has a representation starting with } 10\},\\
\mathfrak{R}_{11} &= \beta^{-3} + \beta^{-4} + \beta^{-3}\mathfrak{R} = \{z \in \mathfrak{R}; z \text{ has a representation starting with } 11\}.
\end{aligned}$$

These three subsets of $\mathfrak{R}$ are scalings, rotations and translations of $\mathfrak{R}$ and are disjoint except for a set of measure zero (see Figure 6).
Clearly $\mathcal{N}$ is a subshift. As before S is the shift map in $\mathcal{N}$. For $z \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $(a_m)_{m\geq 1} \in \mathcal{N}$ a representation of z, one has that $\boldsymbol{r}(S((a_m)_{m\geq 1})) \in \mathfrak{R}$ and

$$\boldsymbol{r}(S((a_m)_{m\geq 1})) = \begin{cases} \beta z & \text{if } a_1 = 0 \\ \beta(z-\beta^{-3}) & \text{if } a_1 = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that the points in $\mathfrak{R}_{11}$ are mapped bijectively into $\mathfrak{R}_{10}$, that the points in $\mathfrak{R}_{10}$ are mapped bijectively to $\mathfrak{R}_0$, and that the points in $\mathfrak{R}_0$ are mapped bijectively to $\mathfrak{R}$.
Now, the parametrization of the boundary of the tribonnacci fractal is constructed as follows. Put $z_0 = \beta^{-4}/(1-\beta^{-3})$ and for each $t \in [0,1]$ let $(a_m)_{m\geq 1}$ be a sequence



FIGURE 6. The tribonnacci fractal with some important features.

in $\{0,1,2\}$ such that $t=\sum_{m\geq 1}3^{-m}a_m$. Put $\kappa(t)=\lim_{m\to\infty}\kappa_{a_1}\circ\kappa_{a_2}\circ\cdots\circ\kappa_{a_m}(z_0)$, where

$$\kappa_0(z)=\beta^{-4}+\beta^{-3}z,$$
$$\kappa_1(z)=\beta^{-4}+\beta^{-6}+\frac{\beta^{-10}}{1-\beta^{-3}}-\beta^{-4}z,$$
$$\kappa_2(z)=\beta^{-3}+\beta^{-4}+\beta^{-3}z.$$

It is shown in Section 4 of [Mes00] that κ is bijective and that

$$\mathfrak{K}'=\kappa([0,1])=\mathfrak{R}\cap(\mathfrak{R}+\beta^{-1}).$$

The set $\mathfrak{K}'$ is also part of the boundary of the tribonnacci fractal. The rest of the boundary is obtained by scaling, rotating and translating $\mathfrak{K}'$.
We have that $\mathfrak{K}'\subseteq\mathfrak{R}_0\cup\mathfrak{R}_{11}$, that is, every point in $\mathfrak{K}'$ has a representation starting with either 0 or 11. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{K}'=\kappa_0(\mathfrak{K}')\cup\kappa_1(\mathfrak{K}')\cup\kappa_2(\mathfrak{K}')$, which is a consequence of Lemma 4 of [Mes00], and

$$\mathfrak{K}'\cap\mathfrak{R}_0=\kappa_0(\mathfrak{K}')\cup\kappa_1(\mathfrak{K}'),\quad \mathfrak{K}'\cap\mathfrak{R}_{11}=\kappa_2(\mathfrak{K}').$$

A simple computation shows that by applying the shift map to $\mathfrak{K}'\cap\mathfrak{R}_{11}$ one obtains $\beta^{-3}+\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K}'$ and that by applying the shift map again one obtains $\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K}'$, as Figure 6 shows.
Finally we describe some basic additional properties of $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathfrak{K}$ that we will need:

Lemma 8.1. *One has*

(i) $\mathfrak{R}\cap\left(\mathfrak{R}+\frac{\beta^2-1}{2}\right)=\varnothing$;

(ii) $\mathfrak{K}'\cap\left(\mathfrak{R}+\frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right)=\varnothing$;

(iii) $\mathfrak{K}' \cap \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{R} = \varnothing$.

8.2.2. *Parametrization of the boundary of fractals associated with the Arnoux-Yoccoz i.e.m.* We will use $\mathfrak{K} = \mathfrak{K}' - z_0$ to parametrize the boundaries of each $\mathfrak{F}_a$ for each $a \in \mathscr{A}$. It is not difficult to see (after a simple computation) that $\mathfrak{K}$ is a curve with endpoints $\kappa(0) - z_0 = 0$ and $\kappa(1) - z_0 = (-\beta^2 - 2\beta - 1)/2$. To get our parametrization we will need the following four lemmas that at the end show that the boundaries of the $\mathfrak{F}_a$'s are Jordan curves.

Lemma 8.2. *The following equalities are satisfied:*

$$\mathfrak{K} = \kappa(1) - \mathfrak{K}$$
$$\mathfrak{K} = \beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-4}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^{-3}) \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^{-3}).$$

Proof. The first equality comes from the fact that $\mathfrak{K}'$ is symmetric, as shown in Lemma 4 of [Mes00]. Furthermore, since $\mathfrak{K}' = \kappa_0(\mathfrak{K}') \cup \kappa_1(\mathfrak{K}') \cup \kappa_2(\mathfrak{K}')$, by subtracting z_0 from both sides, expanding and using the first equality, we get the desired result. □

The following two lemmas will serve to prove that the parts of the boundaries in the Arnoux-Yoccoz fractals coming from the tribonacci fractal intersect in a unique point (see Figure 8).

Lemma 8.3. *We have that* $\mathfrak{K} \cap \left(\beta\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2}\right) = \mathfrak{K} \cap \left(\beta^2\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-\beta^2+1}{2}\right) = \{0\}$.

Proof. Recall that $z_0 = \beta^{-4}/(1-\beta^{-3}) = \frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-3}{2}$ and $\mathfrak{K}' = \mathfrak{R} \cap (\mathfrak{R} + \beta^{-1})$. Set $K_1 = \mathfrak{K} \cap \left(\beta\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2}\right)$ and $K_2 = \mathfrak{K} \cap \left(\beta^2\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-\beta^2+1}{2}\right)$.
(i) Let $z \in K_1$. We will prove that $-\beta^2 z \in K_2$. By definition, we have that $z = \zeta - z_0 = \beta(\zeta' - z_0) + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2}$, where $\zeta, \zeta' \in \mathfrak{K}'$. Therefore,

$$\zeta = \beta\zeta' - \beta z_0 + z_0 + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2} = \beta\zeta' + \frac{\beta^2-1}{2}.$$

From the discussion in Section 8.2.1 ζ' has a representation starting with either 0 or 11. Let a_1, a_2, a_3 be the first three letters of such representation and consider the point $\zeta'' = \beta(\zeta' - \beta^{-3}a_1) \in \mathfrak{R}$, that is, the point obtained by shifting the representation of ζ'. We get that $\zeta = \zeta'' + \beta^{-2}a_1 + \frac{\beta^2-1}{2}$, where $a_1 \in \{0,1\}$.
By Lemma 8.1 item (i) we have that $\mathfrak{R} \cap \left(\mathfrak{R} + \frac{\beta^2-1}{2}\right) = \varnothing$, so $a_1 \neq 0$ and thus $a_1a_2a_3 = 110$. Then, $\zeta' \in \mathfrak{K}' \cap \mathfrak{R}_{11}$, so $\zeta'' \in \beta^{-3} + \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K}' = \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-1}{2}$ and by replacing in previous expressions the value of a_1 we get that $\zeta = \zeta'' + \frac{3\beta^2+4\beta+3}{2}$. Finally, we get that $z \in \mathfrak{K} \cap \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2+4\beta+5}{2}\right)$, so

$$-\beta^2 z \in \left(\frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-1}{2} - \mathfrak{K}\right) \cap (-\beta^2\mathfrak{K}) = K_2,$$

where the last equality is obtained by using Lemma 8.2 and a simple computation.

(ii) Let $z \in K_2$. We will prove that $-\beta z \in K_1$. The proof is similar to (i) so we skip some details.

By definition, we have that $z = \zeta - z_0 = \beta^2(\zeta' - z_0) + \frac{-\beta^2+1}{2}$, where $\zeta, \zeta' \in \mathfrak{K}'$. Therefore,

$$\zeta = \beta^2\zeta' - \beta^2 z_0 + z_0 + \frac{-\beta^2+1}{2} = \beta^2\zeta' + \frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-1}{2}.$$

As in the proof of (i), ζ' has a representation that begins with either 0 or 11. Let a_1, a_2, a_3 be its first three letters and $\zeta'' = \beta^2(\zeta' - \beta^{-3}a_1 - \beta^{-4}a_2) \in \mathfrak{R}$, that is, the point obtained by shifting the representation of ζ' twice. We have that $\zeta = \zeta'' + \beta^{-1}a_1 + \beta^{-2}a_2 + \frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-1}{2}$, where $a_1, a_2 \in \{0, 1\}$.
We know that $a_1a_2 \neq 10$. If $a_1a_2 = 01$, we would have that $\zeta = \zeta'' + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}$. By Lemma 8.1 item (ii) we have that $\mathfrak{K}' \cap \left(\mathfrak{R} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right) = \varnothing$, so this cannot happen. Furthermore, by item (iii) of the same lemma we have that $\mathfrak{K}' \cap \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{R} = \varnothing$, so $a_1a_2 \neq 00$. We obtain $a_1a_2a_3 = 110$, so $\zeta = \zeta'' + \frac{3\beta^2+4\beta+5}{2}$ and we deduce that $\zeta'' \in \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K}' = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-3\beta^2-4\beta-5}{2}$. Finally, $z \in \mathfrak{K} \cap \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right)$, so

$$-\beta z \in \left(\frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-1}{2} - \mathfrak{K}\right) \cap (-\beta\mathfrak{K}) = K_1,$$

where the last equality is obtained by using the previous lemma.

From (i) and (ii) we find that if z belongs to either K_1 or K_2, then $\{\beta^n z, -\beta^n z\}$ meets $K_1 \cup K_2$ for infinitely many integers $n \geq 0$. Since $K_1 \cup K_2$ is bounded and $|\beta| > 1$, we must have that $z = 0$. □

Lemma 8.4. *We have that* $(\mathfrak{K} - 2\beta^2 - 3\beta - 4) \cap \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-3\beta^2-4\beta-7}{2}\right)$ *is a unique point.*

Proof. We illustrate the proof in Figure 7. Observe that $(\mathfrak{K} - 2\beta^2 - 3\beta - 4) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}$. By the previous lemma and a translation, a rotation and a scaling, $\mathfrak{K} - 2\beta^2 - 3\beta - 4$ is a subset of $\operatorname{int}\mathfrak{R}$ up to one point. On the other hand, $\left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-3\beta^2-4\beta-7}{2}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{R} - 1 - \beta^{-1}$. We know from [Mes00] that $\mathfrak{R} - 1 - \beta^{-1} \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{int}\mathfrak{R}$, then $\left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{-3\beta^2-4\beta-7}{2}\right)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{R}$ up to one point. □

Now we give the parametrization of the boundaries of the Arnoux-Yoccoz fractals. Define,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{C}_1 &= (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K}) \cup (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 1) \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2+4\beta+3}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2+4\beta+3}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}\right), \\
\mathscr{C}_2 &= \mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta\mathfrak{K} - \beta) \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2}\right), \\
\mathscr{C}_4 &= \beta\mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \beta + 1) \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \beta + 1) \cup (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - \beta - 1) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$



FIGURE 7. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.4.

$$\mathscr{C}_5 = \beta\mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \beta + 1) \cup \left(\beta\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+3}{2}\right),$$

$$\mathscr{C}_7 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} \cup (\mathfrak{K} - 1) \cup (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} - 1) \cup (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - \beta - 2)$$
$$\cup \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}\right) \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}\right),$$

$$\mathscr{C}_8 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} \cup (\mathfrak{K} - 1) \cup \left(\beta^{-1} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}\right) \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}\right)$$

and $\mathscr{C}_3 = \mathscr{C}_2$, $\mathscr{C}_6 = \mathscr{C}_5$, $\mathscr{C}_9 = \mathscr{C}_8$.

Lemma 8.5. *For each $a \in \mathscr{A}$ we have that $\mathscr{C}_a$ is a Jordan curve.*

Proof. In the definition of each $\mathscr{C}_a$, the terms between unions correspond to the segments in the boundary of $\mathfrak{F}_a$ shown in Figure 8 in the clockwise order, starting at 0. So it is enough to see that the intersection of two consecutive segments is a single point. Indeed, using the results for the tribonnacci fractal from [Mes00] we get that the intersection of most of the pairs of contiguous segments have only one point. The conclusion of the lemma follows from the two previous lemmas.
For example, consider the segments $\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K}$ and $\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 1$, which are part of $\mathscr{C}_1$. By translating by $-\beta^{-1}z_0$ and replacing $\mathfrak{K}$ by $\mathfrak{K}' - z_0$, we get that these segments in intersect in a single point if and only if $\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K}'$ and $\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K}' + \beta^{-2} + \beta^{-1}$ do. These two segments are part of the boundary the tribonacci fractal, which is a Jordan curve. Another example are the segments $\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}$ and $\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K}$, which are also part of $\mathscr{C}_1$. We can amplify by β to get that these segments intersect in a single point if and only if $\mathfrak{K}$ and $\beta\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2+1}{2}$ do, which is implied by Lemma 8.3. □



FIGURE 8. Description of Arnoux-Yoccoz fractals and their features.

Now we are ready to prove that the $\mathscr{C}_a$'s are parametrizations of the boundaries of the Arnoux-Yoccoz fractals.

Lemma 8.6. *For each $a \in \mathscr{A}$ we have that $\mathfrak{F}_a$ is the closure of the interior (in the Jordan sense) of $\mathscr{C}_a$. Furthermore, if $\sigma(a)$ can be written as $\sigma(a) = bc$ with $b, c \in \mathscr{A}$ then $\mathfrak{F}_b \cap \operatorname{int}(\gamma(b) + \mathfrak{F}_c) = \varnothing$ and $\operatorname{int} \mathfrak{F}_b \cap (\gamma(b) + \mathfrak{F}_c) = \varnothing$.*

Proof. We will make the identifications $3 \sim 2$, $6 \sim 5$, $9 \sim 8$. By definition of $\mathscr{C}_a$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_1 &= (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K}) \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2) \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 3}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 3}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_2 &= \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} \cup (\mathfrak{K} - 1) \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 1}{2}\right) \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 1}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_4 &= \mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 2) \cup (\beta^{-4}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 2) \\
&\quad \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - 2\beta - 2) \cup \left(\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 4\beta + 5}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta + 4\beta + 5}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_5 &= \mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 2) \cup \left(\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 4\beta + 5}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 4\beta + 5}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_7 &= \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - \beta - 1) \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - \beta - 1) \\
&\quad \cup (\beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} - 2\beta^2 - 3\beta - 3) \cup \left(\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 3}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 3}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_8 &= \beta^{-2}\mathfrak{K} \cup (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - \beta - 1) \cup \left(\beta^{-2} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 3}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 3}{2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 8.2 when necessary, we find that

(19)

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_2 \cup \beta^{-1}(-\beta + \mathscr{C}_5) &= \mathscr{C}_1 \cup (\mathfrak{K} - 1), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_4 \cup \beta^{-1}(-\beta^{-1} + \mathscr{C}_5) &= \mathscr{C}_2 \cup (\beta^{-4}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 2) \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - 2\beta - 2), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_1 \cup \beta^{-1}(\beta^{-1} + \mathscr{C}_7) &= \mathscr{C}_4 \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_1 \cup \beta^{-1}(\beta^{-1} + \mathscr{C}_8) &= \mathscr{C}_5 \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_2 \cup \beta^{-1}(-\beta + \mathscr{C}_8) &= \mathscr{C}_7 \cup \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 1}{2}\right), \\
\beta^{-1}\mathscr{C}_2 &= \mathscr{C}_8.
\end{aligned}$$

We have that the following equations stated in (6-1) of [ABB11] produce a unique solution for the given γ:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathfrak{F}_1 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_2 \cup \beta^{-1}(-\beta + \mathfrak{F}_5), & \mathfrak{F}_2 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_4 \cup \beta^{-1}(-\beta^{-1} + \mathfrak{F}_5), \\ \mathfrak{F}_4 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_1 \cup \beta^{-1}(\beta^{-1} + \mathfrak{F}_7), & \mathfrak{F}_5 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_1 \cup \beta^{-1}(\beta^{-1} + \mathfrak{F}_8), \\ \mathfrak{F}_7 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_2 \cup \beta^{-1}(-\beta + \mathfrak{F}_8), & \mathfrak{F}_8 = \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_2. \end{array} \tag{20}$$

Finally, let $\mathfrak{F}'_a$ be the closure of the Jordan interior of $\mathscr{C}_a$. We have to show that $(\mathfrak{F}'_a)_{a\in\mathscr{A}}$ satisfies (20). We have that (see Figure 8)

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{K} - 1 \subseteq \mathfrak{F}'_1, \qquad (\beta^{-4}\mathfrak{K} + \beta^2 + \beta + 2) \cup (\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} - \beta^2 - 2\beta - 2) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}'_2 \\ &\left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right) \cup \left(\beta^{-3}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}'_4, \\ &\left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{3\beta^2 + 6\beta + 7}{2}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}'_5, \qquad \left(\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{K} + \frac{\beta^2 + 2\beta + 1}{2}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}'_7. \end{aligned}$$

So, by (19), we conclude that $(\mathfrak{F}'_a)_{a\in\mathscr{A}}$ satisfies (20), which proves that $\mathfrak{F}_a = \mathfrak{F}'_a$ for each $a \in \mathscr{A}$.
The second part of the follows directly from the parametrization (see Figure 8). □

It is straightforward from the previous lemma that:

Corollary 8.7. *$\partial\mathfrak{F}_a = \mathscr{C}_a$ for each $a \in \mathscr{A}$.*

8.2.3. *Unique representation property for the A-Y i.e.m.* We finally prove that every extreme point of each fractal $\mathfrak{F}_a$ has a unique representation.

Lemma 8.8. *For any $a \in \mathscr{A}$, extreme points in the boundary of $\mathfrak{F}_a$ have a unique representation. That is, T has the unique representation property for β.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. We prove that extreme points in $\mathfrak{F}_a$ with more than one representation have an eventually periodic representation. This together with Lemma 5.7 gives a contradiction.
Let $z \in \partial\mathfrak{F}_a$ be an extreme point with two representations. By shifting and using Lemma 5.5 we can assume that the first letters in these representations are different. This implies that $\sigma(a)$ cannot be a single letter, so we get that $\sigma(a) = bc$ for some $b, c \in \mathscr{A}$. Then $z \in \beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_b \cap \beta^{-1}(\gamma(b) + \mathfrak{F}_c)$ and by Lemma 8.6

$$z \in \partial\mathfrak{F}_a \cap (\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_b \cap \beta^{-1}(\gamma(b) + \mathfrak{F}_c)) = \partial\mathfrak{F}_a \cap \partial\beta^{-1}\mathfrak{F}_b \cap \partial\beta^{-1}(\gamma(b) + \mathfrak{F}_c).$$

Now, to get the desired contradiction, we prove that these points have an eventually periodic representation. There are seven cases (see Figure 8 to understand the cases):
(i) if $a = 1$, then $z = -1$ or $z = \frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-3}{2}$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (3, 5, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = -1$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by

$$x_2 = (\varepsilon, 3, 5)(\varepsilon, 4, 6)(1, 7, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 2, 9)(\varepsilon, 4, 5)(1, 7, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 2, 9)(\varepsilon, 4, 5)\ldots$$

is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \frac{-\beta^2-2\beta-3}{2}$;

(ii) if $a = 2$, then $z = -\beta^2 - 2\beta - 2$ or $z = \beta^2 + \beta + 2$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (4, 5, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = -\beta^2 - 2\beta - 2$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by

$(p_1^{x_2}, c_1^{x_2}, s_1^{x_2}) = (4, 5, \varepsilon)$, $(p_2^{x_2}, c_2^{x_2}, s_2^{x_2}) = (1, 8, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_2} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 3$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \beta^2 + \beta + 2$;

(iii) if $a = 3$, then $z = -\beta^2 - 2\beta - 2$ or $z = \beta^2 + \beta + 2$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (4, 6, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = -\beta^2 - 2\beta - 2$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_2}, c_1^{x_2}, s_1^{x_2}) = (4, 6, \varepsilon)$, $(p_2^{x_2}, c_2^{x_2}, s_2^{x_2}) = (1, 9, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_2} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 3$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \beta^2 + \beta + 2$;

(iv) if $a = 4$, then $z = \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2$ or $z = -\beta^2 - \beta - 1$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (1, 7, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_2}, c_1^{x_2}, s_1^{x_2}) = (\varepsilon, 1, 7)$, $(p_2^{x_2}, c_2^{x_2}, s_2^{x_2}) = (3, 5, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_2} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 3$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = -\beta^2 - \beta - 1$;

(v) if $a = 5$, then $z = \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2$ or $z = \frac{3\beta^2+6\beta+7}{2}$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (1, 8, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by

$$x_2 = (\varepsilon, 1, 8)(3, 5, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 8)(\varepsilon, 3, 5)(4, 6, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 9)(\varepsilon, 3, 5)(4, 6, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 9)\ldots$$

is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \frac{3\beta^2+6\beta+7}{2}$;

(vi) if $a = 6$, then $z = \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2$ or $z = \frac{3\beta^2+6\beta+7}{2}$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (1, 9, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \beta^2 + 2\beta + 2$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by

$$x_2 = (\varepsilon, 1, 9)(3, 5, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 8)(\varepsilon, 3, 5)(4, 6, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 9)(\varepsilon, 3, 5)(4, 6, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 9)\ldots$$

is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \frac{3\beta^2+6\beta+7}{2}$;

(vii) if $a = 7$, then $z = -1$ or $z = \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}$. The point $x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by $(p_1^{x_1}, c_1^{x_1}, s_1^{x_1}) = (2, 9, \varepsilon)$ and $p_m^{x_1} = \varepsilon$ for every $m \geq 2$ is an eventually periodic representation of $z = -1$, and the point $x_2 \in \mathcal{S}_a$ defined by

$$x_2 = (\varepsilon, 2, 9)(4, 5, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 8)(\varepsilon, 3, 5)(4, 6, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 9)(\varepsilon, 3, 5)(4, 6, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, 1, 9)\ldots$$

is an eventually periodic representation of $z = \frac{\beta^2+2\beta+1}{2}$. □

Acknowledgement. The first author is grateful to the MathAmsud grant BEX 10674/12-8. The second and third authors are grateful to the CMM-Basal grant PFB03.

References

[ABB11] P. Arnoux, J. Bernat and X. Bressaud. "Geometrical models for substitutions". In: *Exp. Math.* 20.1 (2011), pp. 97–127.

[AY81] P. Arnoux and J.-C. Yoccoz. "Construction de difféomorphismes pseudo-Anosov". In: *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I Math.* 292.1 (1981), pp. 75–78.

[Bar99] R. Barreto. "On C^r-class of conjugacy between affine interval exchange maps and its isometric model". PhD thesis. IMPA, 1999.

[BBH14] X. Bressaud, A. I. Bufetov and P. Hubert. "Deviation of ergodic averages for substitution dynamical systems with eigenvalues of modulus 1". In: *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 109.2 (2014), pp. 483–522.

[BHM10] X. Bressaud, P. Hubert and A. Maass. "Persistence of wandering intervals in self-similar affine interval exchange transformations". In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 30.3 (2010), pp. 665–686.

[CG97] R. Camelier and C. Gutiérrez. "Affine interval exchange transformations with wandering intervals". In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 17.6 (1997), pp. 1315–1338.

[Cob02] M. Cobo. "Piece-wise affine maps conjugate to interval exchanges". In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 22.2 (2002), pp. 375–407.

[CS01] V. Canterini and A. Siegel. "Automate des préfixes-suffixes associé à une substitution primitive". In: *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* 13.2 (2001), pp. 353–369.

[Den32] A. Denjoy. "Sur les courbes définies par les équations différentielles à la surface du tore". In: *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 11.9 (1932), pp. 333–376.

[Fog02] P. Fogg. *Substitutions in Dynamics, Arithmetics and Combinatorics*. Vol. 1794. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.

[Kea75] M. Keane. "Interval exchange transformations". In: *Math. Z.* 141 (1975), pp. 25–31.

[Lev87] G. Levitt. "La décomposition dynamique et la différentiabilité des feuilletages des surfaces". In: *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 37.3 (1987), pp. 85–116.

[LPV07] J. H. Lowenstein, G. Poggiaspalla and F. Vivaldi. "Interval exchange transformations over algebraic number fields: the cubic Arnoux-Yoccoz model". In: *Dyn. Syst.* 22.1 (2007), pp. 73–106.

[LPV08] J. H. Lowenstein, G. Poggiaspalla and F. Vivaldi. "Geometric representation of interval exchange maps over algebraic number fields". In: *Nonlinearity* 21.1 (2008), pp. 149–177.

[Mes00] Ali Messaoudi. "Frontière du fractal de Rauzy et système de numération complexe". In: *Acta Arith.* 95.3 (2000), pp. 195–224.

[MMY10] S. Marmi, P. Moussa and J.-C. Yoccoz. "Affine interval exchange maps with a wandering interval". In: *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 100.3 (2010), pp. 639–669.

[Mos92] B Mossé. "Puissances de mots et reconnaissabilité des points fixes d'une substitution". In: *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 99 (1992), pp. 327–334.

[Que87] M. Queffélec. *Substitution dynamical systems—spectral analysis*. Vol. 1294. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.

[Vee78] W. Veech. "Interval exchange transformations". In: *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique* 33.1 (1978), pp. 222–272.

[Via06] M. Viana. "Ergodic theory of interval exchange maps". In: *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 19.1 (2006), pp. 7–100.

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Av. Fernando Ferrari 514, Goiabeiras, Vitória, Brasil.
E-mail address: milton.e.cobo@gmail.com

Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática and Centro de Modelamiento Matemático, CNRS-UMI 2807, Universidad de Chile, Beauchef 851, Santiago, Chile.
E-mail address: rgutierrez@dim.uchile.cl

Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática and Centro de Modelamiento Matemático, CNRS-UMI 2807, Universidad de Chile, Beauchef 851, Santiago, Chile.
E-mail address: amaass@dim.uchile.cl